A Commentary On The Epistle To The Hebrews, Volume 2



MOSES STUART, RENSSELAER DAVID CHANCEFORD ROBBINS

A Commentary On The Epistle To The Hebrews, Volume 2

You are holding a reproduction of an original work that is in the public domain in the United States of America, and possibly other countries.You may freely copy and distribute this work as no entity (individual or corporate) has a copyright on the body of the work.This book may contain prior copyright references, and library stamps (as most of these works were scanned from library copies).These have been scanned and retained as part of the historical artifact.

This book may have occasional imperfections such as missing or blurred pages, poor pictures, errant marks, etc. that were either part of the original artifact, or were introduced by the scanning process. We believe this work is culturally important, and despite the imperfections, have elected to bring it back into print as part of our continuing commitment to the preservation of printed works worldwide. We appreciate your understanding of the imperfections in the preservation process, and hope you enjoy this valuable book.

INDEX

TO

COMMENTARY ON THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS.

VOL. I.

APOLLOS; was he the author of our epistle? 278.

AUGUSTINE; his testimony, 129.

BARNABAS; has passages resembling our epistle, 87. Was he the author of it? 272 seq.

BERGER; maintains our epistle to be a homily, 4 seq.

BERTHOLDT; his remarks on the testimony of Pantenus, 94 seq.; remarks on the testimony of Clemens Alex., 100 seq.; his objections to Eusebius' testimony, 116 seq.; remarks on internal evidence of our epistle, that Paul was its author, 137; Objections against the opinion, that Paul was the author of our epistle, 174 seq.

BOEHME; his objections against the Pauline origin of our epistle, 258 seq.

BOLTEN; his opinion, that the epistle was written to the dispersed Jewish Christians in Asia Minor examined, 31 seq.

CAIUS; his testimony, 121 seq.

CARPZOFF; sense which he attributes to the word, *Hebrews*, 45.

CESAREA; was our epistle directed to the church there? 68 seq.

CLEMENT OF ALEXANDRIA; his testimony respecting our epistle, 98 seq.

CLEMENT OF ROME; quotes our epistle, 75 seq.; Testimony, ibid. Was he the author of it? 276 seq.

COMMENTATORS; on our epistle, 287 seq.

CORINTHIANS; first epistle to, compared, as to peculiarities, with the epistle to the Hebrews, 241 seq.

CYPRIAN; his testimony, 125.

DE WETTE; his objections against the Pauline origin of our epistle, examined, 253 seq.

EBIONITES; did not admit our epistle; reason why, 64 seq.

EICHHORN; sense which he attributes to the word, *Hebrews*, examined, 44 seq.; his objection to the opinion, that the epistle was written to the church in Palestine, examined, 58 seq.; remarks on the testimony of Pantenus, 94; remarks on the testimony of Clemens Alex., 99 seq.; his objections to Eusebius' testimony, 116 seq.; remarks on internal evidence, 139 seq.; opinion about the Alexandrine origin and hue of epistle, examined, 287 seq.

EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS; early division of opinion about the author of it, 1 seq.; question whether it is an epistle or a homily, 4 seq.; to what church written? 9 seq.; addressed to those who had an intimate knowledge of the Jewish rites, etc., 48 seq.; objections against the supposition, that it was written to the church in Palestine, examined, 54 seq.; author, 90 seq. In what language was it originally written, 279.

EUSEBIUS OF CESAREA; his testimony respecting our epistle, 113 seq.

EVIDENCE; *internal*, that Paul wrote our epistle, 132 seq.; from Heb. 13: 23. p. 132; from Heb. 13: 18, 19. p. 135; from Heb. 13: 24. p. 139.

————, *internal*, from the sentiment, form, method, style, and diction, 141 seq.—from the sen-

3290 (RECAP)
.558

V.2 27734

timent, 148 seq.;—from the form and method, 152 seq.;—from the diction, 160 seq.

HEBRAISMS; of our epistle, exhibited, 260 seq.

HEBREWS; meaning of the word as used in the inscription of the epistle, 8 seq. particularly, 42 seq.

HERMAS; has a passage resembling our epistle, 87.

IGNATIUS; has passages resembling our epistle, 88.

IRENAEUS; his testimony respecting our epistle, 119 seq.

JEROME; his testimony, 127 seq.

JEWS; those who lived abroad, did not much frequent the worship of the temple etc., 46 seq.; were not so zealous as the Palestine Jews, about Levitical rites, 48 seq.

JUSTIN MARTYR; quotes our epistle, 88 seq.

LARDNER; some insufficient arguments of his, to prove that our epistle was directed to the church in Palestine, examined, 38 seq.

LUDWIG; conjecture about the direction of our epistle, examined, 37.

LUKE; was he the author of our epistle? 275.

MICHAELIS; some insufficient arguments of his, to prove that our epistle was directed to the church in Palestine, examined, 38 seq.

MURATORIUS; testimony of an ancient anonymous writer, respecting the N. Test. Canon, contained in his Antiqq. Ital., 122 seq.

NOESSELT; his opinion, that the epistle was written to the church at Thessalonica, examined, 25 seq.

NOVATUS; his testimony, 125 seq.

OBJECTIONS; against the opinion that our epistle was directed to the church in Palestine, examined, 54 seq.

Various objections by Eichhorn, 58 seq., 94, 99 seq., 116 seq., 139 seq.

By Bertholdt, 94 seq., 100 seq. 116 seq., 137.

Against the opinion that Paul was the author of our epistle; by Bertholdt, 174 seq.; by Schulz, 194 seq.; by Seyffarth, 232 seq.

——— nature of, examined, 241.

——— by De Wette, examined, 253.

——— by Boehme, 258.

ORIGEN; his testimony respecting our epistle, 104 seq., 109 seq.

PANTENUS OF ALEXANDRIA; his testimony respecting our epistle, 92 seq.

POLYCARP; has passages resembling our epistle, 87 seq.

RESULT; viz. of the examination of objections, made against the opinion that our epistle was directed to the church in Palestine, 67; of the examination of testimony, respecting the author of our epistle, 129;—of the examination of objections against the Pauline origin of our epistle, 271 seq.

SCHULZ; various objections against the opinion, that Paul was the author of our epistle, 194 seq.—objections from *words* and *phrases* used in our epistle, 218 seq.;—from words employed in a peculiar sense, 224 seq.;—from favourite expressions, 225.

SEYFFARTH; his objections against the Pauline origin of our epistle examined, 232 seq.—objections from the peculiarity of the matters treated of, 232 seq.;—from peculiar phrases, 235;—from peculiar forms and juncture of words, 235;—from words employed in a sense *sui generis*, 237;—from ἅπαξ λεγόμενα, 239.

STORR; his opinion that the epistle was written to the church in Galatia, examined, 10 seq.

TERTULLIAN; his testimony, 123.

TESTIMONIES; viz. respecting the origin of our epistle, by various Christian fathers, 112, 126.

TIMOTHY; his connexion with Paul, and his being ἀπολελυμένον, 63.

WEBER; his opinion, that the epistle was addressed to the church at Corinth, examined, 32 seq.

WETSTEIN; conjecture about the direction of our epistle, examined, 37.

COMMENTARY

ON THE

EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS.

IN TWO VOLUMES.

BY M. STUART
Associate Professor of Sacred Literature in the Theol. Seminary at Andover.

VOL. II.

ANDOVER:
PUBLISHED AND FOR SALE BY MARK NEWMAN.
Codman press....Flagg & Gould.
1828.

PREFACE.

It is proper to advertise the reader, that in the translation of the Epistle to the Hebrews, which is prefixed to the present volume, I have purposely avoided the usual division into chapters and verses, which is exhibited in our common editions of the Scriptures. I have done this, because the sense is sometimes disturbed by it, and the reader is unwarily led to associate things together, in a manner which the writer of the epistle never intended.

The words or phrases, which are supplied in the translation, and which are not expressed in the original Greek, I have uniformly included in brackets, so that the reader may at once see the extent of the liberty that has been taken, in order to render the version more explicit.

For the sake of accommodation, the designation of the chapters and verses is made upon the margin. The larger pauses mark the end of a verse, when they occur in a line that is opposite to any number designating a verse; and when these fail to do it, the designation is made by a perpendicular stroke (|).

I have, in most cases, repeated the greater part of the translation, in printing the Commentary or Notes upon the Original. This has been done, merely to save the reader the trouble of turning continually back to the version; which is often tedious, and always inconvenient. But I have not been careful always to repeat *verbatim*, in the notes, the words of the translation, as they stand at the commencement of this volume. In fact, the reader may regard the version at the head of the volume, and that contained among the notes, as two different versions. They were, for the most part, made at different times, and in a measure independently of each other. The former, is that on which I have bestowed most pains as to diction. The latter, is merely designed to facilitate the labours of the student.

5290 (RECAP)
.888
v.v 27734

In regard to the *Excursus*, different opinions will not improbably be entertained respecting them. The expediency of them, their length, and the correctness of some of the positions which they advance, may all be called in question. In matters so difficult and delicate, and which have so long been the theme of controversy, it cannot be expected that there will be, at once, an entire and universal agreement of opinion. The writer of these sheets does not venture to flatter himself with the expectation, that all will adopt his views. Of one thing however he is very confident; and this is, that he claims no authority of any kind, over the opinions of others. But he thinks it proper to express his sincere desire, that those, who may differ from him as to some of the opinions advanced in the Excursus, or in the body of the work, would thoroughly examine the subjects in respect to which they may think him erroneous, before they pass sentence of condemnation. It is not too much, moreover, to request that they would assign their *reasons* why they differ from him. In this way, differences of opinion may ultimately aid in the discovery of truth, with respect to dark and difficult subjects, and so prove to be of real utility to the church.

Subjects of high and awful interest in religion should not be treated with obtrusive confidence, nor with presumption. I shall most thankfully accept any better light than I now have, let it come from what quarter it may. Being a Protestant, and *nullius addictus jurare in verba magistri*, I deem it not unreasonable to expect, that where I may be in the wrong, I may be convinced by *argument*, not silenced by *authority*. Appeals should ever be made, by Protestants, to the understanding; not *ad invidiam*, nor to current or popular prejudice.

With these explanations of my views and feelings, I commit the work to the friends of exegetical study, not without much solicitude as to the opinion which the wise and the good may entertain respecting it; but still, with some hope, that it may serve to aid such as are aiming to attain a critical knowledge of the Scriptures, or at least, excite some to efforts, which shall end in the production of better Commentaries on the Scriptures, than are yet before the public.

M. STUART.

Theological Seminary, Andover,
March 25, 1828.

PART II.

THE

EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS.

Dignity of Christ. His superiority over the angels.

I. God, who in ancient times spake often and in various
ways to the fathers by the prophets, hath in these last days
2 spoken to us by his Son; whom he hath appointed Lord
3 of all things, by whom also he made the worlds; who, (be-
ing the radiance of his glory and the exact image of his sub-
stance, and controlling all things by his own powerful word),
after he had by himself made expiation for our sins, sat down
4 at the right hand of the majesty on high, being exalted as
much above the angels, as he hath obtained a name more
excellent than they.

5 For to which of the angels said he, at any time, "Thou
art my Son, this day have I begotten thee?" And again, "I
6 will be his Father, and he shall be my Son?" Again also,
when he bringeth his first begotten into the world, he saith,
"Let all the angels of God worship him."

7 Moreover, of the angels it is said, "Who maketh his an-
gels winds, and his ministering servants a flame of fire."
8 But of the Son, "Thy throne, O God, is eternal; a sceptre
9 of uprightness is the sceptre of thy kingdom. Thou hast
loved righteousness, and hated iniquity; therefore, O God,

thy God hath anointed thee with the oil of gladness above
10 thy fellows." Also, "Thou Lord, in the beginning, didst
lay the foundations of the earth, and the heavens are the work
11 of thy hands; | they shall perish, but thou shalt endure; yea,
12 they shall all wax old like a garment, | and as a vesture shalt
thou fold them up, and they shall decay; but thou art the
same, and thy years shall never cease."
13 Unto which of the angels, also, hath he ever said, "Sit
thou at my right hand, until I make thine enemies thy foot-
14 stool?" Are they not all ministering spirits, sent forth to as-
sist those who are to obtain salvation?

Exhortation diligently to seek the salvation proffered by the Lord of glory.

II. It behooveth us, therefore, the more abundantly to give
heed to the things which we have heard, lest at any time we
2 should slight them. For if the law communicated by angels
was established, and every transgression and disobedience re-
3 ceived a just reward; how shall we escape, if we neglect so
great salvation? which, being first declared by the Lord, was
afterwards confirmed unto us by those who heard [him];
4 God also bearing witness with them, by signs, and wonders,
and diverse miraculous powers, and communications of the
Holy Spirit, according to his will.

Further declaration of Christ's superiority over the angels. Objections against this, drawn from his human nature, removed by showing the elevation of that nature, and the important objects accomplished by assuming it.

5 Moreover, unto the angels hath he not put in subjection
the world that was to come, of which we are now speaking.
6 But one, in a certain place, hath testified, saying, "What is
man, that thou art mindful of him; or the son of man, that
7 thou dost regard him? [Yet] thou hast made him but little
lower than the angels; thou hast crowned him with glory

and honour, and hast set him over the works of thy hands.
8 All things hast thou put under his feet." Now by putting all
things in subjection to him, he left nothing which is not sub-
ject to him. For the present, indeed, we do not see all
9 things yet subjected to him; but we see Jesus, who was
made but little lower than the angels, crowned with glory
and honour on account of the suffering of death, when by
10 the grace of God he had tasted death for all. It became
him, also, for whom are all things, and by whom are all
things, to bestow, on account of sufferings, the highest hon-
ours upon him who is the Captain of their salvation, leading
many sons to glory.

11 Furthermore, both he who maketh expiation, and they
for whom expiation is made, are of one [nature]; for which
12 cause he is not ashamed to call them brethren, saying, "I
will declare thy name to my brethren; in the midst of the
13 congregation will I praise thee." And again, "I will put
my trust in him." And again, "Behold, I and the children
14 which God hath given me!" Since then the children are
partakers of flesh and blood, himself also in like manner par-
took of them, in order that by his death he might subdue him
15 who had a deadly power, that is, the devil, and free those,
who, through fear of condemnation, had during their whole
lives been exposed to a state of bondage.

16 Besides, he doth not at all help the angels, but he helpeth
17 the seed of Abraham. Hence it was necessary, that in all
respects he should be like to his brethren, so that he might
be a merciful and faithful high priest as to things which per-
tain to God, in order to make atonement for the sins of
18 the people. For inasmuch as he himself suffered, being
tempted, he is able to succour those who are tempted.

Comparison of Christ with Moses. Warning against disregarding his admonitions.

III. WHEREFORE, holy brethren, who have received the heavenly invitation, attentively consider Jesus, the apostle and
2 high priest whom we have acknowledged; who was faithful to him that appointed him, even as Moses [was], in all
3 his house. For he is worthy of more glory than Moses, inasmuch as the builder is entitled to more honour than the
4 house. (Now every house is built by some one, and he who
5 formed all things is God.) Moses, however, was faithful in all his house as a servant, for the sake of testifying those
6 things which were to be declared; but Christ, as a Son, over his house; whose house we are, provided we hold fast unto the end our confidence and joyful hope.
7 Wherefore, as the Holy Spirit saith, "To day, while ye
8 hear his voice, | harden not your hearts, as in the provoca-
9 tion, in the day of temptation in the wilderness, | when your fathers tempted me, proved me, and saw my works forty
10 years. Wherefore I was angry with that generation, and said, They do always err in their hearts, and they have not
11 acknowledged my ways. So I sware in my wrath, They shall not enter into my rest."
12 Beware, brethren, lest there be in any of you an evil and unbelieving heart, so that he may apostatise from the living
13 God. But admonish one another continually, while it is called to day, so that no one of you may become hardened by
14 sinful delusion. For we shall be made partakers of the blessings which Christ bestows, provided we hold fast even to the end our first confidence.
15 With regard to the saying, "To day, while ye hear his

16 voice, harden not your hearts, as in the provocation;" who
now were they, that when they heard did provoke? Nay, did
17 not all, who came out of Egypt under Moses? And with
whom was he angry, forty years? Was it not with those
18 who sinned, whose corpses fell in the wilderness? To whom
did he swear, that they should not enter into his rest, except
19 to those who did not believe? We see, then, that they
could not enter in, because of unbelief.

The rest promised to believers in ancient times is still proffered. The threatenings against unbelief remain in full force.

IV. Let us beware, therefore, since a promise is still left of
entering into his rest, lest any one of you should come short
2 of it. For to us also blessings are proclaimed, as well as to
them; the word, however, which they heard, did not profit
them, not being connected with faith in those who heard it.
3 But we who believe do enter into the rest; as he says, "So
I sware, in my wrath, [unbelievers] shall not enter into my
rest;" namely, [rest from] the works which had been per-
4 formed, after the foundation of the world was laid. For [the
Scripture] speaketh, in a certain place, concerning the seventh
day, in this manner, "And God rested, on the seventh day,
5 from all his works." And again, in this [manner], "They
6 shall not enter into my rest." Since then it remaineth that
some must enter into that [rest], and they, to whom this bless-
ing was formerly proclaimed, did not enter in because of
unbelief, [it followeth, that believers only can enter into it.*]
7 Again, he specifieth a particular day, To-day, when speak-
ing by David, so long a time afterwards; as it is said, "To-
8 day, while ye hear his voice, harden not your hearts." Now,

* Supplied from v. 3.

if Joshua had given them rest, then he would not have spoken of another day.

9 Consequently, there remaineth a rest for the people of
10 God. He, moreover, who entereth into his [God's] rest, will also cease from his own works, as God did from his.

11 Let us strive, then, to enter into that rest, so that no one
12 may perish in like manner, through unbelief. For the threatening of God hath an active and mighty power, yea, it is sharper than any two edged sword, piercing even to the dividing asunder of both life and spirit, and of the joints and marrow: he also judgeth the thoughts and purposes of the
13 heart; nor is there any thing which can be concealed from his sight, but all is naked and exposed to the view of him, unto whom we must render our account.

Comparison of Christ with the Jewish high priest introduced. Reproof for ignorance of the higher doctrines of the Christian religion, followed by encouragement and exhortation.

14 Moreover, since we have a high priest who has passed through the heavens, Jesus the Son of God, let us hold
15 fast to our profession. For we have not a high priest, who is not able to sympathize with our weaknesses; but one who was tempted in all respects as we are, [yet] without sin.
16 Let us, therefore, approach the throne of grace with confidence that we may obtain mercy, and find favour, so as to be assisted in time of need.

V. Now every high priest, taken from among men, is appointed in behalf of men on account of things which pertain to God, that he may present both oblations and sacrifices for
2 sin; being able to shew kindness to the ignorant and the erring, inasmuch as he himself is compassed with infirmity.

3 On this account, also, he must present sin-offerings, as well
4 for himself as for the people. Moreover, no one assumeth for himself this honour, but he is called [thereto] of God, even as Aaron was.

5 In like manner, Christ also did not claim for himself the honour of being high priest; but he who said, "Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee," [bestowed this hon-
6 our upon him]. So also he saith, in another place, "Thou art a priest forever, after the order of Melchisedek."

7 The same, in the days of his incarnation, (having offered up prayers and supplications, with strong cries and with tears, unto him that was able to save him from death, and being de-
8 livered from that which he feared,) ı although a Son, was made acquainted with obedience in a state of suffering.
9 Then, when exalted to glory, he became the author of eter-
10 nal salvation, to all who obey him, ı being called of God, "A high priest, after the order of Melchisedek."

11 Respecting him we have much to say, which it will be
12 difficult to explain, since ye are dull of apprehension. For even when ye ought to be able to teach, after [so long] a time, ye have need to be taught again the first elements of the oracles of God, and need milk rather than solid food.
13 For every one, who is a partaker of milk, is unskilled in the
14 doctrines of religion; he is yet a child. But solid food is for those of mature age, who have faculties exercised by practice for the distinguishing of both good and evil.

VI. Wherefore, leaving the first principles of Christian doctrine, let us go on toward a mature state [of religious knowledge]; not laying again the foundation, concerning repentance from works which cause death, and faith towards God;
2 [concerning] the doctrine of baptisms, and the laying on

of hands, and the resurrection of the dead, and eternal judg-
3, 4 ment. And this will we do, if God permit. For it is im-
possible, that they, who have been once enlightened, and have
tasted of the heavenly gift, and been made partakers of the
5 holy Spirit, † and have tasted the good word of God, and
6 the miraculous powers of the age which was to come, † and
have fallen away, should be again renewed to repentance,
since they have crucified for themselves the Son of God,
and openly exposed him to shame.

7 Now the earth, which drinketh in the rain that frequent-
ly cometh upon it, and bringeth forth fruits useful to those for
8 whose sake it is tilled, receiveth blessings from God. But
that which bringeth forth thorns and briars, is reprobate, and
is near to a curse which will end in burning.

9 But, beloved, we confidently hope for better things con-
cerning you, even those connected with salvation, although
10 we thus speak. For God is not unkind, so that he will for-
get your labour, and the love which ye have shown toward
his name, in having performed kind offices toward the saints,
and in still performing them.

11 Moreover, we are desirous that every one of you should
manifest the same diligence, for the sake of a full assurance
12 of hope, even to the end; so that ye may not be slothful,
but imitators of those, who, through faith and patient expec-
tation, have come to the possession of promised blessings.
13 For when God made a promise to Abraham, seeing he
could swear by no greater, he sware by himself, saying,
14 "I will greatly bless thee, and exceedingly multiply thee."
15 And so, having patiently waited, he obtained the promised
16 blessing. Now men swear by one who is greater, and the
oath for confirmation [maketh] an end of all dispute among

17 them. In like manner, God, desirous of shewing more
abundantly to the heirs of promise the immutability of his
18 purpose, interposed by an oath; so that by two immutable
things, concerning which it is impossible for God to lie, we,
who have sought for a refuge, might be strongly persuaded
19 to hold fast the hope that is set before us, | which we cleave
to as an anchor of the soul sure and firmly fixed, and which
20 entereth within the vail, | whither Jesus our forerunner hath
gone, being made high priest forever, after the order of Mel-
chisedek.

Comparison of Christ, as a priest, with Melchisedek. New order of things required by the appointment of such a priest; which appointment was made with the solemnity of an oath; and the office created by it was perpetual, allowing of no succession like that of the Jewish priests.

VII. Now this Melchisedek was king of Salem, and priest of
the most high God. The same met Abraham returning
2 from the slaughter of the kings, and blessed him. To him,
also, Abraham gave a tenth part of all. By interpretation,
[his name] meaneth, first, King of Righteousness; and then,
he is also King of Salem, which meaneth, King of Peace.
3 Without father, without mother, without genealogy; having
neither beginning of days nor end of life, but being like to the
Son of God; he remaineth a high priest perpetually.
4 Consider, now, how great he must be, to whom Abraham
5 the patriarch gave a tenth part of the spoils! Even the
sons of Levi, who take the office of priests, have indeed a
command by the law to tithe the people, that is, their breth-
6 ren, although descended from the loins of Abraham; but
he, whose descent is not counted from them, tithed Abraham,
7 and blessed him to whom the promises were made. And
beyond all controversy, the inferior was blessed by the su-
perior.

8 Here, also, men receive tithes who die; but there, one
9 of whom it is testified that he liveth. Yea, (if I may so
speak), even Levi himself, who receiveth tithes, was tithed in
10 Abraham; for he was then in the loins of his ancestor,
when Melchisedek met him.
11 Moreover, if there had been a perfect accomplishment
of what was needed, by the Levitical priesthood, (for the
law was given to the people, in connexion with this), what ne-
cessity was there still, that another priest should arise after
the order of Melchisedek, and not be named after the order
12 of Aaron? But if the priesthood be changed, there must
13 needs be also a change of the law. Now he, concerning
whom these things are said, belonged to a different tribe,
14 none of whom served at the altar; for it is plain, that our
Lord sprang from Judah, in respect to which tribe, Moses
15 said nothing concerning the priesthood. And still more
manifest is it, [that the priesthood is changed], if another
16 priest hath arisen, like to Melchisedek; who hath not been
made so by a law of temporary obligation, but by an authori-
17 ty of endless duration. For [the Scripture] declareth, "Thou
art a priest forever, after the order of Melchisedek."
18 There is, also, a setting aside of the preceding law, be-
19 cause it was weak and unavailing. For the law did not fully
accomplish any thing; but the introduction of a better hope
[doth], by which we draw near to God.
20 Furthermore, in as much as not without an oath [Jesus
21 was made a priest], † (for they are made priests without an
oath, but he with an oath, by him who said to him, "The
Lord hath sworn and will not repent, Thou art a priest for-
22 ever, after the order of Melchisedek,)" † by so much hath Je-
sus become the surety of a better covenant.

23 Those priests, moreover, are many, because they are not
24 suffered to continue by reason of death; but he, because he
continueth forever, hath a priesthood without any succession;
25 and on this account he is able always to save those who
come unto God by him, since he ever liveth to interpose in
their behalf.

The subject of Christ's qualifications for the office of a priest, (proposed in 5: 23, and briefly discussed in 5: 7—9), resumed. His superiority over the Jewish priests, in respect to these, exhibited.

26 Such a high priest, moreover, was needful for us, who is
holy, harmless, undefiled, separate from sinners, and exalted
27 above the heavens; who hath not any daily necessity, like
the high priests, to offer sacrifices, first for their own sins,
and then for the sins of the people; for this he did, once for
28 all, when he offered up himself. Now the law maketh men
high priests, who have infirmity; but the word of the oath,
which was since the law, [maketh] the Son [high priest],
who is exalted to glory for ever more.

Expiatory office of Christ as a priest. His functions, the dispensation under which they are performed, the place of exercising them, the manner and effects of them, compared with those of the Jewish priests.

VIII. The principal thing, however, among those of which we
are speaking, is, that we have such a high priest, who is
seated on the right hand of the throne of Majesty in the heav-
2 ens, a minister of the sanctuary, and of the true tabernacle
which the Lord hath reared and not man.
3 Now every high priest is appointed, in order that he may
present oblations and sacrifices; whence it becometh necessa-
ry, that this one also should have something which he may pre-
4 sent. But if he were on earth, then he could not be a priest,
seeing there are priests who present oblations according to
5 the law; (the same who perform service in [that sanctuary

which is but] a mere copy of the heavenly one; for Moses, when about to build the tabernacle, was divinely admonished, "See, now," said he, "that thou make all things according
6 to the pattern shewed thee in the mount.)" But now, he hath obtained a service which is more excellent; as much more as the covenant is better of which he is mediator, and which is sanctioned by better promises.

7 Moreover, if that first covenant had been faultless, then
8 would no place have been sought for the second. But finding fault [with the first], he saith to them, "Behold the days are coming, saith the Lord, when I will make a new covenant
9 with the house of Israel and with the house of Judah; not according to the covenant which I made with their fathers, in the day when I took them by the hand, to bring them out of the land of Egypt; for they did not continue in my cove-
10 nant, and I rejected them, saith the Lord. But this is the covenant, which I will make with the house of Israel after those days, saith the Lord; I will impress my laws upon their minds, and engrave them upon their hearts; and I will be
11 their God, and they shall be my people. No one shall teach his fellow-citizen, nor any one his brother, saying, Know the Lord; for all shall know me, from the least even to the great-
12 est. For I will be merciful in respect to their iniquities, and their sins and their transgressions will I remember no more."

13 By saying, "a new [covenant]," he representeth the first as old; now that which hath become old, and is advancing in age, is nigh to dissolution.

IX. Moreover the first [covenant] had ordinances of service,
2 and a sanctuary of an earthly nature. For an outer tabernacle was prepared, in which was the candlestick, and the table, and the shew-bread, which is called, The holy place.

3 And behind the second vail was the tabernacle, which is call-
4 ed, The holy of holies, | containing the golden censer, and
the ark of the covenant overlaid with gold on every part, in
which was the golden urn that contained the manna, and the
rod of Aaron which budded, and the tables of the covenant.
5 Over it, also, were the Cherubim of glory, overshadowing the
mercy-seat. Of these things, it is not necessary, at present,
particularly to speak.
6 Now these being thus prepared, the priests performing
the services entered continually into the outer tabernacle.
7 But into the inner one, only the high priest [entered], once
in each year, not without blood, which he presented for him-
8 self and for the sins of the people. By this the Holy Spirit
signified, that the way to the most holy place was not yet
9 open, while the first tabernacle had a standing; which hath
been a type down to the present time, in which both oblations
and sacrifices are presented, that cannot fully accomplish
what is needed in regard to the conscience, for him who
10 performeth the services; [and all the] ordinances pertaining
to the flesh, had respect only to meats, and drinks, and divers
11 ablutions, enjoined until the time of reformation. But Christ
being come, a high priest of future blessings, through a great-
er and more perfect tabernacle, not made with hands, that is,
12 not of this [material] creation, | he entered once for all into
the holy place, not with the blood of goats and of bullocks,
13 but with his own blood, procuring eternal redemption. Now
if the blood of bulls and goats, and the ashes of a heifer
sprinkling the unclean, cleanse in respect to the purification
14 of the flesh, | how much more shall the blood of Christ, who
by an eternal Spirit offered himself without spot to God,

purify our conscience from works which cause death, so that we may serve the living God!

15. On this account, also, he is the mediator of a new covenant, so that, his death being a ransom for the sins [committed] under the former covenant, they who have been called might receive the promised blessing of the eternal in-
16 heritance. For where there is a testament, it is necessary
17 that the death of the testator should take place; because a testament is valid in respect to those only who are dead, seeing it hath no force, while the testator is living.

18 Hence, not even the first [covenant] was ratified with-
19 out blood. For when all the commandment, according to the law, had been read by Moses to all the people, taking the blood of bullocks and of goats, with water and scarlet wool and hyssop, he sprinkled both the book itself and all
20 the people, saying, "This is the blood of the covenant
21 which God hath enjoined upon you." The tabernacle, also, and likewise all the vessels for service, did he sprinkle in
22 the same manner with blood. Indeed, almost every thing is required by the law to be purified by blood; and without the shedding of blood there is no forgiveness.

23 Since, then, the likenesses of heavenly things must needs be purified in this manner, the heavenly things themselves
24 [must be purified] by better sacrifices than these. For Christ did not enter into a sanctuary made with hands, which is only a copy of the true one, but into heaven itself, that he
25 might thenceforth appear before God for us. Yet not that he might frequently make an offering of himself, like the high priest who entereth into the sanctuary every year with
26 blood not his own, (for then he must needs have often suffered, since the foundation of the world); but now, at the

close of this age, he hath once for all made his appearance,
in order that he might remove the punishment due to sin, by
27 the sacrifice of himself. For since it is appointed unto men to
28 die but once, and after this [cometh] the jugdment; so Christ
also, after having once for all made an offering of himself to
bear the sins of many, will appear, at his second [coming],
without a sin-offering, for the salvation of those who wait for
him.

X. Moreover, the law, which containeth a mere outline of
future blessings, and not the complete image of these things,
can never, by those yearly sacrifices which are continually
offered, fully accomplish what is needed for those who ap-
2 proach [the altar]. For if it could, then would not these
offerings have ceased, because the worshippers, once for all
made clean, would no longer have been conscious of sins?
3 On the contrary, by these [sacrifices] yearly remembrance
is made of sin.

4 And truly, it is impossible that the blood of bulls and
5 goats should take away sin. Wherefore, [Christ], entering
into the world, saith, "Sacrifice and oblation thou desirest
6 not, but a body hast thou prepared for me; in whole burnt
7 offerings and [offerings] for sin thou hast no pleasure. Then
said I, Lo! I come, O God, to do thy will; (in the volume
8 of the book it is written concerning me)." When he saith,
in the first place, "Sacrifice and oblation, and whole burnt
offerings and [offerings] for sin, thou desirest not, nor hast
pleasure in them," (which are presented according to the
9 law); ı [and] then saith, "Lo! I come to do thy will;" he
10 abolisheth the first, that he may establish the second. By
this will, expiation is made for us, through the offering of the
body of Jesus Christ once for all.

11 Now every priest standeth, performing daily service, and
oftentimes presenting the same sacrifices which can never
12 take away sin; but this one, having once offered a perpetual
13 sacrifice for sin, sat down at the right hand of God, thence-
14 forth waiting until his enemies be made his footstool. By
one offering, then, he hath fully accomplished, forever, what
was needed by those for whom expiation is made.

15 Moreover, the Holy Spirit also testifieth this to us; for
16 after saying, "This is the covenant which I will make with
them, after those days, saith the Lord, I will write my
laws upon their hearts, and engrave them upon their minds,"
17 then [he saith], "Their sins and their iniquities will I re-
18 member no more." But where there is remission of these,
there is no more offering for sin.

Exhortation to perseverance, from a consideration of the faithfulness of God, of the severe doom of apostates, and of the sufferings which the Hebrew Christians had already endured for the sake of religion

19 Having then, brethren, free access to the sanctuary,
20 by the blood of Jesus, in a new and living way, which he
21 hath consecrated through the vail, (that is, his flesh); and
22 [having] also a high priest over the house of God; let us
approach in full confidence, with a true heart, being purified
23 as to our hearts from a consciousness of evil. Being cleans-
ed, also, as to our bodies, with pure water, let us hold fast
without wavering the hope which we profess; for faithful is
24 he who hath promised. Let us, moreover, attentively regard
one another, for the sake of exciting to love and good works;
25 not forsaking the assembling of ourselves together, (as the
custom of some is), but admonishing [one another]; and
this so much the more, as ye see the day approaching.

26 · Moreover, should we voluntarily sin, after having receiv-
ed the knowledge of the truth, there remaineth no more
27 sacrifice for sin; but a certain fearful expectation of punish-
ment, yea, of fiery indignation which will consume the adver-
28 saries. Whosoever transgressed the law of Moses, suffered
29 death without mercy, in case of two or three witnesses; of
how much sorer punishment, think ye, shall he be counted
worthy, who hath trodden under foot the Son of God, and
regarded the blood of the covenant by which he hath been
consecrated as unclean, and done despite to the Spirit of
30 grace! Surely we know him, who hath said, "Vengeance is
mine, I will render it," saith the Lord; and again, "The
31 Lord will judge his people." It is a fearful thing to fall into
the hands of the living God.

32 Call to mind, now, the former days, in which, after ye
were enlightened, ye endured a great contest with suffer-
33 ings; partly because ye were made a public spectacle both by
reproaches and afflictions, and partly because ye had sympa-
34 thy with those who were thus treated. For ye did truly
sympathize with those who were prisoners, and cheerfully
suffer the plundering of your own substance, knowing that
ye have for yourselves a better possession in heaven, yea,
35 one which is enduring. Cast not away, then, your confidence,
which will obtain a great reward.

36 Ye have need, it is true, of patient waiting, in order that
when ye have done the will of God, ye may receive the
37 promised blessing. Yet a very little while, nevertheless, and
38 "he who is coming will come, and will not delay." "The
just," also, "shall live by faith;" but, "If any man draw
39 back, my soul hath no pleasure in him." We, however, are
not of those who draw back unto destruction; but of those
who believe unto the salvation of the soul.

Description of faith, and of the effects of it in respect to the saints of ancient times.

XI. Now faith is confidence in respect to things hoped for,
2 [and] convincing evidence of things not seen. On account
of this, moreover, the ancients obtained commendation.
3 By faith we perceive, that the worlds were formed by
the word of God, so that the things which are seen, were not
made from those which do appear.
4 By faith Abel offered to God a better sacrifice than
Cain, on account of which he was commended as righteous,
God himself bestowing commendation upon his oblations;
and by the same, though dead, he still speaketh.
5 By faith Enoch was translated, without seeing death, and
"he was no more found, because God had translated him."
He is commended, also, as "having pleased God," before
6 his translation. But without faith, it is impossible to please
him; for he who cometh unto God, must believe that he is,
and that he will reward those who seek him.
7 By faith Noah, being divinely admonished respecting the
future, with reverence prepared an ark for the safety of his
household, by which he condemned the world, and obtained
the justification which is by faith.
8 By faith Abraham obeyed, when called to go forth unto
the place which he was to receive for a possession; yea,
9 he went forth not knowing whither he was going. By faith
he sojourned in the land of promise, while it belonged to
strangers, dwelling in tents with Isaac and Jacob, who were
10 heirs of the same promise; for he expected a city which
11 hath foundations, whose builder and maker is God. By
faith, also, Sarah herself received the power of conception,
and this beyond the customary season of life, inasmuch as
12 she counted him to be faithful who had promised. Where-

fore there sprang, even from one who was dead too as to these things, [a seed] like the stars of heaven for multitude, and like the sand on the shore of the sea which cannot be numbered.

13 These all died in faith, not having received the promised blessings; but seeing them afar off, and hailing them with joy, they professed themselves to be strangers and sojourners
14 on the earth. Now they who thus profess, shew that they
15 are in quest of a country; for if they had cherished the remembrance of that from which they came, they had oppor-
16 tunity to return thither. But now they were desirous of a better [country], that is, of a heavenly one. Wherefore God is not ashamed of them, [nor] to be called their God; for he hath prepared a city for them.

17 By faith Abraham, when put to trial, made an offering of Isaac; yea, he who had received the promises made an of-
18 fering of his only Son; unto whom it had been said, "After
19 Isaac shall thy seed be named;" counting that God was able to raise him even from the dead, whence also, comparatively [speaking], he obtained him.

20 By faith Isaac blessed Jacob and Esau, in regard to the
21 future. By faith Jacob, when about to die, blessed each of Joseph's sons, and bowed himself upon the top of his staff.
22 By faith Joseph, at the close of life, made mention of the departure of the children of Israel [from Egypt], and gave commandment respecting his own bones.

23 By faith Moses, after his birth, was concealed for three months, by his parents, because they saw that he was a good-
24 ly child, and did not fear the king's commandment. By faith Moses, when arrived at mature age, refused to be called the
25 Son of Pharaoh's daughter, ı choosing rather to suffer affliction with the people of God, than to enjoy the pleasures of

26 sin for a season; counting reproach, such as Christ en-
27 dured, to be greater riches than all the treasures of Egypt;
for he had respect to a state of reward. By faith he left
Egypt, not fearing the anger of the king; for he continued
28 stedfast, as one who seeth him that is invisible. By faith he
observed the passover and the sprinkling of blood, so that
he who destroyed the first born might not touch them.
29 By faith they passed through the Red Sea, as on dry
land; which the Egyptians assaying to do, were drowned.
30 By faith the walls of Jericho fell down, after they had been
31 compassed about for seven days.
By faith Rahab, the harlot, having entertained the spies
in a friendly manner, perished not with the unbelieving.
32 And what shall I say more? For time would fail me,
should I tell of Gideon, of Barak also, and Sampson, and
33 Jephtha, of David too, and Samuel, and the prophets; who,
through faith, subdued kingdoms, executed justice, obtained
34 promised blessings, stopped the mouths of lions, quenched
the violence of fire, escaped the edge of the sword, were
made strong from a state of infirmity, became mighty in war,
35 overthrew the armies of foreigners. Women recovered their
dead by a resurrection. Some were tortured, not accepting
deliverance, in order that they might attain to a better resur-
36 rection. Others were tried by mockings and scourges, and
37 also by bonds and imprisonment. They were stoned, they
were sawn asunder, they were tempted, they perished by the
murderous sword, they went about in sheep-skins and goat-
38 skins, suffering want, afflicted, injuriously treated, (of whom
the world was not worthy), wandering around in deserts and
mountains, in caves also and dens of the earth.
39 All these, moreover, who are commended on account of
their faith, did not receive the promised blessing; God hav-

ing provided some better thing for us, so that without us they could not obtain a full accomplishment of what was needed.

Encouragement to persevere. Trials must not dishearten, for God sends them in kindness to his children. The gospel holds out more that is cheering and encouraging, than the law. The voice of its author must not be slighted.

XII. Since now we are encompassed by so great a multitude of witnesses, laying aside every incumbrance, and especially the sin which easily besetteth us, let us run with perseverance the
2 race which is set before us; looking unto Jesus, the author and perfecter of our faith, who, on account of the joy set before him, endured the cross, not regarding shame, and hath sat down at the right hand of the throne of God.
3 Consider, now, him who endured such opposition against himself from sinners, lest becoming discouraged in your minds
4 ye grow weary. Ye have not yet resisted unto blood, in your
5 struggle against sin. And have ye forgotten the exhortation, which is addressed to you as children, "My son, do not slight the chastenings of the Lord, nor be disheartened when re-
6 proved by him; for whom the Lord loveth he chasteneth,
7 and scourgeth every son whom he receiveth?" If ye endure chastisement, God is dealing with you as children; for what
8 son is there, whom his father does not chasten? But if ye are without chastisement, of which all [children] are partakers, then are ye bastards and not sons.
9 Furthermore, we have had fathers of our flesh, who have chastened us, and we have yielded them reverence; shall we not much more yield subjection to the Father of [our] spirits,
10 that we may live? They, indeed, chastened us for a little while, according to their own pleasure; but he, for our good,
11 that we might be made partakers of his holiness. Now all chastening seemeth, for the present, not to be matter of joy, but of grief; yet afterwards, it yieldeth the happy fruits of righteousness, to those who are exercised thereby.

12 Wherefore, "Strengthen the weak hands and the feeble
13 knees," and "Make plain the paths for your feet," so that
what is lame may not be wrenched, but rather healed.
14 Follow after peace with all men, and holiness, without
15 which no man shall see the Lord. See to it, that no one
fail of the favour of God; that no root of bitterness spring up
16 and trouble you, and many be defiled thereby. Let there be
no fornicator, nor profane person, like Esau, who for one
17 morsel of meat sold his birthright. For ye know, that when
he was afterwards desirous to obtain the blessing, it was re-
fused; yea, he found no place for a change of mind [in his
father], although he sought for it with tears.
18 Moreover, ye are not come to the mount which could be
touched, and to flaming fire, and thick clouds, and dark-
19 ness, and tempest; nor to the sound of the trumpet, and the
voice of commands, the hearers of which refused that another
20 word should be added to them; (for they could not endure
the admonition, "If even a beast touch the mountain, it shall
21 be stoned;" and—so terrible was the sight—even Moses
22 said, "I fear and tremble):" but ye are come to mount Zion;
and to the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem;
and to an innumerable company, the joyful host of angels;
23 and to the assembly of the first-born, enrolled in heaven; and
to the Judge, the God of all; and to the spirits of the just,
24 who have obtained their final reward; and to the mediator of
the new covenant, Jesus; and to the blood of sprinkling,
which speaketh better things than [the blood of] Abel.
25 Take heed, that ye turn not away from him, who speak-
eth to you; for if they did not escape, who turned away from
him who warned them on earth, much more shall we [not
escape,] if we slight him who [warneth us] from heaven.
26 His voice then shook the earth; but now it is promised, say-

ing, "Yet once more, I will shake not only the earth, but
27 heaven also." Now this "Yet once more," denotes a removing of the things which are shaken, as of created things, in order that the things which are not shaken may remain.
28 Wherefore, having obtained a kingdom which cannot be shaken, let us manifest gratitude, (by which we may serve
29 God acceptably), with reverence and godly fear. For our "God is a consuming fire."

Various practical directions and cautions. Closes with affectionate requests and salutations.

XIII. Let brotherly love continue. Forget not hospitality;
3 for by this, some have entertained angels unawares. Remember those who are in bonds, as if ye yourselves were fellow-prisoners; those who are suffering evil, as being your-
4 selves yet in the body. Let marriage be honourable among all, and the bed undefiled; for whoremongers and adulterers
5 God will judge. Let your conduct be free from covetousness, and be contented with what ye possess. For he hath
6 said, "I will never leave thee, nor forsake thee;" so that we may boldly say, "The Lord is my helper, and I will not be afraid. What can man do to me?"
7 Remember your leaders, who have spoken unto you the word of God; and attentively considering the end of their
8 manner of life, imitate their faith. Jesus Christ is the same,
9 yesterday, to-day, and forever. Be not carried hither and thither by diverse and strange doctrines; for it is good that the heart should be confirmed by grace, and not by meats, by which those have not been profited, who have been occu-
10 pied therewith. We have an altar, of which they have no right to eat, who render their service to the tabernacle.
11 Moreover, the bodies of those animals, whose blood was carried into the sanctuary as a sin-offering by the high priest,

12 were burned without the camp. Wherefore, Jesus also, that
he might make expiation for the people by his own blood,
13 suffered without the gate. Let us, then, go forth to him with-
14 out the camp, bearing reproaches like his; for here we have
15 no abiding city, but are seeking for one yet future. By him,
therefore, let us continually present to God the sacrifice of
praise, that is, the fruit of our lips ascribing praise to his name.
16 Forget not kindness, also, and liberality; for with such
17 sacrifices God is well pleased. Obey your leaders, and be
subject to them; for they watch over your souls, as those who
must give an account. [So obey], that they may do this with
joy, and not with grief, for this would be unprofitable to you.
18 Pray for us; for we trust that we have a good conscience,
19 being desirous in all things to demean ourselves uprightly. I
make this request, also, the more earnestly, in order that I
may speedily be restored to you.
20 Now may the God of peace, that raised from the dead
our Lord Jesus, (who by the blood of an everlasting covenant
21 has become the great Shepherd of the sheep), i prepare you
for every good work, that ye may do his will; working in you
that which is well pleasing in his sight, through Jesus Christ,
to whom be glory forever and ever! Amen.
22 Moreover, I beseech you, brethren, to bear with this word
of exhortation; for I have written briefly to you.
23 Know ye, that our brother Timothy is sent away; with
whom, if he return speedily, I shall visit you.
24 Salute all your leaders, and all the saints. They of Italy
25 salute you. Grace be with you all! Amen.

COMMENTARY.

GENERAL VIEW OF THE CONTENTS OF THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS.

The writer of this epistle is a Hebrew, and addresses his Hebrew brethren, who had made a profession of the Christian religion. Nothing can be plainer, than that those addressed are considered as being in danger of apostasy from that religion. To warn them against this danger, is the principal object of our epistle. In order to do this, the writer proceeds to lay before them the aggravated guilt, and the awful doom, of those who make defection from Christianity; to direct their views towards that crown of glory which fadeth not away, and which is reserved in heaven for all who persevere, even to the end of life, in their fidelity to Christ; to put them on their guard against the various enticements of sin, which might allure them from the path of Christian duty; and especially to guard them against relapsing into superstitious views, respecting the importance and necessity of the ceremonial rites and sacrifices of the Levitical institutions, and against being induced by these to relax their confidence in Jesus, and in his atoning sacrifice.

It was these last sources of danger, to which the Hebrew Christians were particularly exposed. Nothing could well be more magnificent and imposing, than the temple worship as practised by the Jews at that time. The temple, built after their return from the captivity, was not, indeed, so rich in ornament as that which Solomon had built. But it had, at a vast expense, been greatly extended and beautified by Herod. It was regarded by all Jews, as the peculiar dwelling place of Jehovah—the only one in which he deigned to manifest himself on earth. The Jewish nation, also, habitually regarded themselves, as the only one to whom God had made a special revelation. The worship, practised in the temple,

had been instituted by Moses, under divine guidance, and continued, with but partial interruptions, for about 1500 years. All the exterior of this worship was adapted to strike the eye, and impress the mind, of the beholder. The awfulness of the place in which it was celebrated; the magnificent costume of the priests; the spacious and lofty apartment in which they officiated; the solemn part which he who offered any sacrifice was himself called to perform; above all, the apprehension that full pardon for sin and reconciliation to God were obtained by the rites and offerings which the law prescribed; contributed to make deep and lasting impressions on the mind of all Hebrews, who seriously exercised their thoughts on the subject of religion, and paid their devotions in the temple. All their education, from the first dawning of the youthful mind, had a direct tendency to confirm and strengthen these impressions. Never was a nation more enthusiastically attached to its customs, rites, and country, than were the Jews. They looked abroad upon other nations, as outcasts from God, and unworthy of his paternal kindness and blessing.

The New Testament is full of evidence, adapted to shew the correctness of this statement. The disputes which the extension of Christian privileges to the Gentiles occasioned, among the first Jewish converts; the reluctance with which the former were admitted to participate in them; and the repeated. violent, and long protracted opposition that was made to abandoning the peculiar rites of the Mosaic institutions; all contribute to evince, how deeply engraven upon the mind of every Jew was the impression, that the laws of Moses were never to be changed, and that the Messiah himself was rather to restore and modify, than to repeal them.

In such a state of mind had the Christian converts once been, whom the writer of our epistle addressed. What wonder, now, if they were exposed from this quarter to be shaken in their attachment to the new religion which they had professed, and which confessedly gave up all confidence in the religious rites of the Levitical institutions? Temptations from without also assailed them. Their unbelieving Hebrew brethren argued with them; opposed them; ridiculed them; made powerful appeals to all the feelings with which their birth, education, and former worship had inspired them; persecuted them; traduced them to heathen magistrates; and excommunicated them. They suffered the loss of property,

and of liberty. Their lives were threatened. The coming of Christ, which they had supposed would speedily take place for their deliverance, was delayed. How could it be, that human frailty, joined with former prejudices and present sufferings, should not have a dangerous influence upon them?

In this state the apostle saw them to be, and set himself about the important and difficult work of correcting their errors, and encouraging their desponding minds. How was this to be done, with the greatest probability of success? Plainly, arguments and considerations, of such a nature as were best adapted to meet the difficulties with which they were contending, were those to which he would most readily resort. And throughout the whole epistle, it is manifest that he has done this, with consummate skill, judgment, and force.

As the greatest of all the dangers to which the Hebrew converts were exposed, was that which resulted from their former religious attachments and prejudices, excited and augmented, as they daily were, by the efforts of their unbelieving Jewish brethren; so the writer of our epistle employs his principal force, in order to preclude or avert this danger. Other topics are subordinate with him. Although they are often touched upon, and with great skill and power, yet they are so interwoven with the main object before him, that they are in a measure concealed from the first view of a hasty reader.

The general plan of the epistle may be briefly represented. It consists in a comparison of the new dispensation with the old, and in pointing out the various grounds of preference which belong to the new. From this superiority of the new dispensation various arguments are deduced, in order to shew the importance of cleaving to the Christian profession, instead of reverting back to Judaism, which could not now be the means of saving those who embraced it. Considerations of such a nature are repeated, as often as the comparisons introduced afford occasion for them. This accounts for the repetition of hortatory addresses, so often found in our epistle.

The Jews gloried in their dispensation, because angels had been employed as mediators of it, when the law was given at Sinai. In their view, this stamped a high and heavenly honour upon it. Our author does not attack their views of this subject, but he commences his epistle by shewing that Christ, the mediator and

head of the new dispensation, as it regards his name, his rank, his dominion, his creative and eternal power, is superior to the angels, 1: 1—14. On this ground, then, Christianity may claim a precedence; and hence he exhorts them to give their most earnest attention to it, 2: 1—4.

Nor can they object to the superiority of the Messiah, that he possessed a *human* nature, while the angels are spiritual and heavenly beings. For in his human nature he is Lord of the universe, 2: 5—10. It was this nature, too, which gave him a nearer and more endearing sympathy with his followers; and by taking this upon him, he was enabled to make an expiatory offering for sin by his death; so that he is now fitted not only to exercise compassion toward men, but to save them from the bondage of sin, and from its condemning power, 2: 11—18.

Having thus disposed of this topic, he next proceeds to compare Jesus, the head of the new dispensation, with Moses the head of the ancient one. Like Moses, he was set over the house of God, and entrusted with it, and was faithful to his trust. But the honour due to Jesus is as much more than that due to Moses, as the builder of a house is worthy of more honour than the house itself. Christ too was set over God's house as a *Son*; but Moses only as a *servant*, 3: 1—6.

If now the Israelites of old were solemnly admonished to hearken to the precepts given under the Mosaic dispensation; then surely believers in Christ may be more solemnly urged, to beware of disobedience to his injunctions, 3: 7—19. And this warning holds good, and is applicable in all respects, because the rest which was promised to believers in ancient times, and was lost through unbelief, is still proffered to all who believe in Jesus and persevere in their profession, and only to believers, 4: 1—10. Awful commination is indeed still uttered against those who are guilty of apostasy, 4: 11—13.

Thus much for the comparison of Christ with Moses. Next, the writer proceeds to compare Jesus, as a priest, with the Jewish priesthood, and particularly with the high priest, the most dignified of all who were invested with the sacerdotal office.

He first introduces Christ as a compassionate high priest, and exalted to the highest dignity in the heavens, 4: 14—16. Next, he states the various things which are attached to the priesthood,

as existing among the sons of Levi. (1) A high priest must present oblations and sacrifices, 5: 1. (2) He must be compassionate and sympathetic towards others, and especially so, as he is himself frail and erring, 5: 2, 3. (3) He must be appointed of God to this office, 5: 4.

In all these respects, he now goes on to make a comparison of Jesus, the high priest of Christianity, and to shew his superiority. He shews,

First, that Christ was divinely appointed a priest, and that of the highest order, 5: 5, 6.

Next, he shews that Christ our great high priest was compassed with human infirmity, like other priests, so that, like them, he was fitted to exercise compassionate sympathy, 5: 7, 8. But after he had suffered, he was raised to glory and became a high priest of the most exalted order, i. e. of the order of Melchisedek, 5: 9, 10.

The difficulty of the subject now suggested, affords an occasion for the writer to advert to the state of religious ignorance, in which those were whom he addressed, 5: 11—14; to exhort them to come out of it, and to warn them against the fearful danger that would result from not doing so, 6: 1—8. To this he subjoins commendation as to some things, and powerful motives of encouragement, 6: 9—20.

He now resumes the subject of Melchisedek; shews the superiority of his priesthood over that of the sons of Levi, 7: 1—10; and then argues that Christ, who was a perpetual priest of the like order with Melchisedek, must of course be superior to the Jewish priests, 7: 11—25.

Christ too, as high priest, differed in one important respect from other priests, viz. in that he needed no sacrifice for himself, as an erring, sinful man, like the sons of Levi, but was sinless and perfect, yea, even exalted to a state of supreme glory, 7: 26—28.

The great object, however, at which the writer is going to aim in the sequel of his epistle, is, to shew that the high priest of Christianity officiates in heaven for his followers, 8: 1, 2. The Jewish priests perform their functions in a temple, which is merely an image of the heavenly one, 8: 3—6.

The new covenant, of which Jesus is mediator, is altogether superior, also, to the old, 8: 6—13. The ordinances and appa-

ratus of service attached to this, were all mere types of heavenly things, 9: 1—10. The services themselves were imperfect, as to the end attained by them, since they accomplished nothing more than external purification; but the blood of Christ sanctifies internally, and procures eternal redemption and an everlasting inheritance, for all the chosen of God in every age of the world, 9: 11—15.

The new *testament*, which gives an *inheritance* to the people of God, was sanctioned by the *death* of Jesus, 9: 15. Such is the custom in regard to *testaments*, 9: 16, 17. As a symbol of this, even the first covenant, (διαθήκη), with all the apparatus attached to it, was sanctioned by blood, i. e. the emblem of death, 9: 18—22. If the earthly sanctuary was thus consecrated, then the heavenly one must be so, by a sacrifice of a still higher nature, 9: 23, 24. Sacrifices in the earthly temple must be *often* repeated; but the sacrifice of Christ did, *once for all*, accomplish the great purposes for which it was offered, 9: 24—28.

Indeed, no legal sacrifices could make any real atonement for sin, 10: 1—4. Therefore Christ voluntarily proffered himself as a sin offering, entirely and forever to effect this, 10: 5—18.

Thus is completed the comparison of Christ, and of his functions as a priest in the heavenly tabernacle, with the Jewish priests and their functions in the earthly tabernacle. In all respects Jesus the great high priest of the Christian religion, appears greatly superior.

The writer now proceeds to various bold and powerful exhortations, mixed with awful warnings against defection from the Christian religion, 10: 19—31. He sets before them the effects of persevering faith in the ancient patriarchs, prophets, and distinguished worthies, 11: 1—40. This he follows up with continued exhortations, and encouragements, and warnings, 12: 1—29; and then closes his epistle with divers practical directions, cautions, and salutations, 13: 1—25.

Such is the brief view of the course of thought and reasoning in our epistle. It is plain that there are three great points of comparison in it, which constitute the main object at which the writer aims, in order that he may shew the superiority of Christianity over Judaism.

I. The superiority of Christ, the mediator of the new covenant, over angels who were employed as mediators, when the old covenant was established, Chap. I. II.

II. The superiority of Christ, the head of the new dispensation, over Moses the head of the old, Chap. III. IV.

III. The superiority of Christ as high priest of the new dispensation, and of the services which he performs, over the priesthood of the Mosaic institution, and all the services which were appropriate to their office, 5: 1—10: 18.

Exhortations, warnings, reproofs, and encouragements, are intermixed in some manner with the main discussions, ; e. g. 2: 1—4. 3: 1. 3: 7—4: 16. 4: 11—6: 20; but from 10: 19 to the end of the epistle, nearly all is of the nature just described; so that about one half of the epistle is of a parenetical or hortatory nature.

In judging of the relevancy and importance of the subjects discussed in our epistle, it is very plain, that we are not to make up an opinion, deduced merely from viewing the present necessities and condition of Christians. We were not born Jews, nor educated as such. We have none of their prejudices, peculiar sympathies, temptations, and trials. What was adapted to them, in the days of Paul, and under the circumstances above described; nay, what was absolutely indispensable for their instruction, reproof, and confirmation; may, in many respects, be scarcely appropriate to us, in our condition and circumstances. Such is indeed the fact, in regard to many of the things introduced into the epistle to the Hebrews; as I shall have occasion hereafter repeatedly to notice. But who, that judges with any good degree of candour and fairness, would ever think of bringing it as an accusation against our author, that he has inserted in his epistle, that which was altogether appropriate to those whom he addressed, although it may not, and does not, have an equal bearing upon all times and nations? Surely, the last ground of just accusation which can be advanced against any writer, is, that 'he has written in a manner peculiarly adapted to accomplish the end for which he wrote.' In what a different plight would the world of authors be, if all of them were justly liable to such an imputation!

Of necessity, now, many things addressed to the Jews of Paul's day, are comparatively inapplicable to us. So far, however, as our circumstances agree with theirs in any respect, just so far the spirit of what was said to them will apply to us. So far as what was said to them was founded in general Christian truths and principles, just so far we may be instructed and guided by it. Conse-

quently, as it must follow from these positions, the epistle, while it contains many things appropriate to the Hebrews of early times, also contains many which can never cease to interest the church of God, while Christianity exists in the world.

These general views may serve to aid the critical student, in commencing the exegetical study of our epistle. The more particular detail of what is here hinted, is reserved for the introductions to various parts of the epistle, which are inserted, *pro re natâ*, in the body of the commentary which follows.

COMMENTARY.

CONTENTS OF CHAPTERS I. 1 — II. 4.

The object of the writer being to commend Christianity to those whom he addressed, in such a manner as to prevent defection from this religion; he begins by setting forth Christ as the author of the new revelation which God had made to men, 1: 1. He then touches upon the dignity of his office; he is Lord of the universe; which indeed he also created, 1: 2. He is the true image of God, and the representative of his glory and perfections to men; he is endowed with sovereign power; and having made atonement for the sins of men, he is exalted to the highest majesty in the heavens, 1: 3. This mediator of the new dispensation is exalted above angels, who were the mediators of the ancient one. His name, SON, is more exalted than theirs; for they have not been addressed, like him, with such an appellation, 1: 4, 5. He is the object of worship by the angels; while they are employed only as the swift and ready messengers of God, 1: 6, 7. The King Messiah has an eternal and righteous dominion; and is elevated, on account of his love of righteousness, to honour and happiness above all other kings, 1: 8, 9. Him, too, the sacred writer addresses, as the creator of the heavens and the earth, and as immutable and imperishable, 1: 10—12. But no exaltation to such dominion is conferred upon angels, 1: 13; they are only ministerial agents, employed for the good of those, who are to be heirs of the salvation which Christ bestows, 1: 14.

If such be the dignity and elevation of the Messiah, then surely he may justly demand the attentive consideration of all which he addresses to his followers. Obedience to the ancient revelation was enforced by just and unavoidable penalties; how can the neglect of the new and more perfect one go unpunished? 2: 1, 2. Especially must this be the case, since it was promulgated by Christ himself in person, and was confirmed, on the part of God, by a great variety of wondrous miracles, 2: 3, 4.

CHAP. I.

Ἡ πρὸς Ἑβραίους ἐπιστολή. See, on this title, Vol. I. § 10. p. 40. seq.

1. *Πολυμερῶς καὶ πολυτρόπως*, literally *in various parts and in various ways.* Of the Greek commentators, some give a different sense to each of the words; e. g. Theodoret, *πολυμερῶς—τὰς παντοδαπὰς οἰκονομίας σημαίνει, τὸ δὲ πολυτρόπως, τῶν θείων ὀπτασιῶν τὸ διάφορον*, i. e. *πολυμερῶς signifies the various dispensa-*

tions, and *πολυτρόπως the diversity of divine visions.* Theophylact interprets the words in question, by *διαφόρως καὶ πολυειδῶς, diversely, and in various ways.* But Chrysostom expresses the sense of both words, by *διαφόρως* simply. Modern commentators are divided in the same manner. The Greek idiom allows either mode of interpretation; and precedents may be found for each. See Schleusner on the words; and compare Clem. Alex. Strom. I. 4. p. 331. V. 6. p. 667, ed. Potter. If the two words be construed separately, then *πολυμερῶς* should be interpreted as referring to the matter of ancient revelation, given in different parts and at different times, thus conveying the idea of the gradual development of truth in different ages and by different persons; and *πολυτρόπως* must be understood as indicating the *various ways in which these revelations were communicated*, i. e. by dreams, visions, symbols, Urim and Thummim, prophetic ecstacy, etc. But if both words are regarded, as being used only to designate with intensity the *variety* of ancient revelations, (and such a mode of phraseology is very common both in the Greek and Hebrew Scriptures), then the whole may be paraphrased thus; 'God, who in ancient times made communications, *in many different ways*, by the prophets to the fathers, hath etc.' The word *πολυμερῶς* does not, of itself, signify *sundry times;* but still, the idea of *various parts* or *portions*, which it does properly signify, may very naturally be understood as implying, *diverse times* at which, or *occasions* on which, the different parts of revelation were communicated; or the idea of *πολυμερῶς* may be simply that of *repetition*, so that *often* would well communicate the sense of it. In this way I have ventured to translate it.

Of the two modes of interpreting these words, I rather prefer that which separates them, and gives a distinct meaning to each. The writer evidently designs to present an antithesis between the manner of the ancient and the Christian dispensation. This antithesis is rendered more striking, if we understand the first clause in the verse thus; 'God, who in ancient times made communications to the fathers by the prophets, in sundry parts and in various ways, has now made a revelation to us by his Son;' i. e. he has completed the whole revelation, which he intends to make under the new dispensation, by his *Son*,—by his *Son only*, and not by a *long continued series* of prophets, as of old. The apostles, and other inspired writers of the New Testament, received their commu-

nications from the *Son*, who gave them the Holy Spirit, Matt. 11: 27. comp. John 14: 26. 16: 13; and facts shew, that the Christian revelation was completed, during that generation who were cotemporary with the Saviour, when he dwelt on earth.

Πάλαι, in ancient times; for communications by prophets to the Jews had ceased, from the time of Malachi and his cotemporaries, i. e. for the space of about four hundred years. Hence, the writer avoids using an expression which would imply, that revelations had been continued down to the time then present. By *πάλαι*, he evidently means to designate the whole time, during which communications of the divine will were continued, under the former despensation.

Λαλήσας most commonly designates *oral communication*. But since the writer here affirms, that God had spoken (*λαλήσας*) *πολυτρόπως*, it must of course be understood, (as indeed it is often used), to designate the more general idea of *communication made in any manner*, by visions, symbols, etc, as well as by voices.

Τοῖς πατράσι, ancestors; see Wahl's Lex. We might naturally expect that *ἡμῶν* would be subjoined; but Paul commonly uses the word *πατέρες* in the sense just noted, without the pronoun annexed. See Rom. 9: 5. 11: 28. 15: 8.

Ἐν τοῖς προφήταις, by the prophets. The use of *ἐν* with the dative, instead of *διά* with the genitive, is frequent in the New Testament; as any one may see in Wahl's Lexicon, *ἐν* no. 3. a. The *frequent* use of it, in this way, is *Hebraism;* for *ἐν* corresponds to the Hebrew ב, which is employed with great latitude of signification, and in cases of the same nature as that in question; e. g. Hosea 1: 2, *the word of the Lord by Hosea*, בְּהוֹשֵׁעַ. But an occasional use of *ἐν* in a similar way, by native Greek writers, may also be found; e. g. Thucyd. VII. 11, *what has been done before, ye know ἐν ἄλλαις πολλαῖς ἐπιστολαῖς, by many other letters.*

Προφήταις, in the language of the New Testament, means, not only those who predict future events, but *all who were employed by God, as the medium of making religious communications of any kind* to his people.

Ἐπ' ἐσχάτου τῶν ἡμερῶν, in many copies, *ἐπ' ἐσχάτων τῶν ἡμερῶν*. The Seventy use both forms of expression, as a translation of the Hebrew אַחֲרִית הַיָּמִים; thus shewing that they were

regarded by them as *synonymes*. It is a matter of indifference, as to the *sense* of the text, which reading is adopted.

The meaning of the phrase is best understood, from a comparison of the corresponding expressions in Hebrew. In the Old Testament, אַחֲרִית הַיָּמִים, אַחֲרִית, אַחֲרֵי־כֵן, and יוֹם אַחֲרוֹן, are often employed *synonymously*; and all of them to designate the general idea of *hereafter, at a future time, in the sequel*. Whether this future time be more or less remote, depends entirely on the context, and scope of the passage. See Gen. 49: 1. Num. 24: 14. Deut. 4: 30. Prov. 31: 25. But אַחֲרִית הַיָּמִים, in particular, is used to denote *the future period in which the Messiah (ὁ ἐρχόμενος) was to appear*; Is. 2: 2. Hos. 3: 5. Micah 4: 1. Joel 3: 1 [2: 28], אַחֲרֵי־כֵן. This phrase, (as it would seem from the usage in these places), early passed into a kind of technical designation of the time of the Messiah, or rather of the new dispensation under him. Thus Rabbi Nachmanides, on Gen. 49: 1, says "All our doctors agree, that אַחֲרִית הַיָּמִים means, *the times of the Messiah*." That such a use of the phrase in question, was already an established one, in the time of our Saviour, is abundantly evident, from the frequency with which *αἱ ἔσχαται ἡμέραι* is employed, in the New Testament, to designate *the period of the Christian dispensation*. Like other appellations, acquired in a similar way, (comp. Luke 7: 20), it continued to be employed, after the "last days," i. e. the Christian dispensation, had commenced; and it is employed to designate *any part of the time which this dispensation comprises*; being limited only by the context, in the same manner as the Hebrew אַחֲרִית, etc. as exhibited above. In John 6: 39, 40, 44, 54 and 11: 24. *ἐσχάτη ἡμέρα* is indeed used to denote the *end of time*, when the resurrection of the dead will take place. But in each of these cases, *ἀναστήσω* or *ἀνάστασις* accompanies it, so as to save all doubt in respect to its meaning. In all other cases, it designates *the period of the new dispensation*. Many synonymous expressions are also employed to designate the the same idea; e. g. *ὁ ἔσχατος καιρός, οἱ ἔσχατοι καιροί, ἡ ἐσχάτη ὥρα*, and *ὕστεροι καιροί*.

The Jews, it is said, divided the periods of the world into הָעוֹלָם הַזֶּה, *the present age* or *world*, i. e. the period of the Mosaic dispensation, and הָעוֹלָם הַבָּא, *the age* or *world to come*, i. e. the time of the Messiah's reign. The former is called, in the New Testament, *ὁ αἰὼν οὗτος, ὁ νῦν αἰὼν τοῦ κόσμου τούτου, ὁ αἰὼν ὁ*

ἐνεστώς, ὁ καιρὸς οὗτος, and *ὁ αἰών*; the latter, *ὁ αἰὼν ὁ μέλλων —ἐρχόμενος—ἐκεῖνος, οἱ αἰῶνες οἱ ἐπερχόμενοι, ἡ οἰκουμένη ἡ μέλλουσα*. This latter class of expressions, thus understood, are equivalent to the phrases *ἔσχαται ἡμέραι, ἔσχατον ἡμερῶν*, etc.

Such is the representation of Wahl, (on the word *αἰών*, in his Lexicon), of Bretschneider (Lex.), and of other critics, in regard to this subject. But that it is too definitely made, and therefore not in all respects well founded, is quite clear from the very authority to which Wahl refers; i. e. Buxtorf. Lex. Chald. sub voc. עוֹלָם. The Rabbins certainly used עוֹלָם הַזֶּה for *mundus hic, mundus habitabilis*; also for *mundus medius*, i. e. the regions of the air, stars, firmament, etc; and for *mundus supremus*, i. e. of angels and spirits. It is equally certain, that they employed עוֹלָם הַבָּא for *mundus post resurrectionem mortuorum, mundus animarum a corpore solutarum*, as well as for *the age of the Messiah*. Buxtorf merely says, "Quidam per עוֹלָם הַבָּא intelligunt יְמוֹת הַמָּשִׁיחַ, *dies Messiae*." It would seem then, that Wahl and Bretschneider have made an excessive use of the supposed Rabbinic sense of the word *αἰών*.

Be this, however, as it may; from the Old Testament usage we may easily make out, (as I have endeavoured to do), the sense of *ἐπ' ἐσχάτου τῶν ἡμέρων*. The phrase, in Heb. 1: 1, appears to mean, *during the last dispensation*, or, *under the last period*, viz. that of the Messiah.

Τούτων, THESE *last days*, is as much as to say, 'The period in question has already commenced.'

Ἡμῖν, to us, by a *κοινωσις*, i. e. a figure of speech, or mode of speaking, in which the writer joins himself with those whom he addresses. The meaning is, *to Christians, to the church*; not excluding others, but intending still to designate, in this place, particularly himself and those to whom he wrote. So Luke uses *ἡμῖν* for *Christians*, in chap. 1: 1; and Paul in like manner, often, in his epistles.

Ἐν υἱῷ, i. e. *διὰ τοῦ υἱοῦ*. So Chrysostom and Theophylact; for *ἐν* here is used as above, in *ἐν τοῖς προφήταις*. That the article would be added to *υἱῷ* here, if the phrase was constructed according to the common usage of the Greek language and of the New Testament writers, is quite obvious; although I find none of the modern commentators who take notice of it. In accordance with this principle, both Chrysostom and Theophylact supply it in

their paraphrase, expressing the sense by *διὰ τοῦ υἱοῦ*. After all the *rules* which have been laid down respecting the insertion or omission of the article in Greek, and all the theories which have been advanced, he who investigates for himself, and is guided only by *facts*, will find not a little that is arbitrary in the *actual* use of it. The cases are certainly very numerous, where Greek writers insert or reject it at pleasure. What is this but an *arbitrary* use of it? Some very sensible remarks on this subject may be found, in Lawrence's Remarks on our English Version.

It is plain, in the present case, that *υἱῷ* is *monadic*; that it designates one individual peculiarly distinguished; and that the pronoun *αὐτοῦ* is omitted after it; on all which accounts, (according to *theory*), the article should be added. But all the Codices of the New Testament agree in omitting it. The circumstance is in itself of but little importance; still, as it has an important bearing upon *theories* which respect the use of the article, it well deserves particular notice.

Perhaps *υἱῷ*, in this case, may be employed as a kind of *proper* name, (just as we now use it); and on this account it omits the article, by a license usual in respect to proper names.

Some distinguished commentators have maintained, that the sentiment of Heb. 1: 1, is in direct opposition to the opinion commonly received by the Christian fathers, and still very generally maintained, viz. that the Son of God made all the revelations to the ancient prophets; and that all the *theophanies*, mentioned in the Old Testament, are to be ascribed to the *Logos*. These commentators suppose their own views, in opposition to the sentiment of those fathers, to be confirmed by Heb. 2: 1—4; where the *aggravated* guilt of those who reject the gospel, which was revealed by the Son of God, is urged; and the writer grounds the fact of its *being aggravated*, upon the assumption that the law, in ancient times, was spoken only by the mediation of angels. But still, though this reasoning seems to be satisfactory, at first view, it should be remembered that the writer is there, as well as in Heb. 1: 1, speaking of the Son of God as *incarnate*, as possessing our nature and addressing us in it. In this manner he did not address the church, in ancient times; and the emphasis may lie upon this circumstance. Comp. John 1: 14. For, that the *Logos*, or Christ in his divine nature, did make revelations to the ancient church,

seems to be an obvious deduction, from John 12: 41. 1 Cor. 10: 9. 10: 4, and other like passages.

2. Ὃν ἔθηκε κληρονόμον πάντων, *whom he has constituted lord of all*, i. e. of the universe. Ἔθηκε, *constituted, appointed, ordained*; see Wahl on τίθημι, no. 3. In the same sense the Greeks employ τίθημι.

Κληρονόμον, *lord, possessor*, in accordance with the Heb. idiom. In classic Greek, κληρονόμος is (1) *One who acquires any thing by lot*; (2) *One who inherits any thing after the death of the possessor*. The Son *inherited* the universe in neither of these ways; consequently κληρονόμος here is employed in the manner of the Hebrew יָרַשׁ, which means, *to take into possession* in any manner, or simply, *to acquire*. *To inherit* is only a secondary sense of יָרַשׁ. The Latins employed *haeres*, in a sense like that here assigned to κληρονόμος. Thus Justinian, Inst. II. 19. § ult., *Pro haerede gerere*, est *pro domino gerere*; veteres enim *haeredes pro dominis* appellabant. So Festus, *Haeres* apud antiquos pro *domino* ponebatur. Comp. Gal. 4: 1. Acts 10: 36. 2: 36. Ps. 89: 27 [28]. John 17: 10; which confirm the interpretation here given, as to the correctness of the sentiment which it conveys.

Δι οὗ, *by whom*. It is contended here, that διά is not limited to signify the *instrumental cause* (so called), but that it often designates the *principal cause*. This is true; see Wahl on διά, 1. c. where both the classical and New Testament usage of διά, in this sense, is shewn. But there is still a *possibility* of the sense which Grotius gives it here, viz. *on account of whom*; see Wahl, no. 2. and to the instances there adduced of διά used with the genitive, and signifying *on account of*, add Rom. 5: 19 bis. 8: 3, and perhaps 2 Cor. 9: 13 and 2 Pet. 1: 3, διὰ δόξης. In all these cases, however, διά does not properly denote the *final cause* or *end* for which a thing is done; but only a *motive* for doing it, an *instrument* as it were in bringing it about. To say, that the worlds were made *on account of the Son*, as the final end or object of them, would imply something more, or something different from saying, that they were made *by him*. The sense which Grotius puts upon διά cannot be defended by any examples sufficiently plain, and cogent enough to justify the admission of it.

Τοὺς αἰῶνας ἐποίησε, *he* [i. e. θεός] *made the worlds*, or *the universe*. So, beyond any reasonable doubt, αἰῶνες is to be under-

stood in 11: 3, and in 1 Tim. 1: 17. The singular (*αἰών*) is not employed to designate *world*. The classical use of *αἰών* is (1) *Age, period of time.* (2) *Age of man, time of life.* *Αἰῶνας*, then, is used here, (like עוֹלָם, עוֹלָמִים, in the Chaldee and later Hebrew), for *world, worlds, universe.* Theodoret explains it as meaning, *ages;* and so others have since done. But what is the sense of the assertion, that God made the *ages* by his Son? If we understand this of the common periods of the life of man; or (with Theodoret) of the ages of the world; or of the Jewish and Christian dispensations, with others; what is it to the writer's purpose to assert this, in a passage which is evidently designed to shew the *exalted pre-eminence* of the Son of God? As to the sentiment conveyed by the interpretation which I have adopted, viz. *he made the worlds*, it is confirmed by Eph. 3: 9. Col. 1: 15—19. John 1: 3, 10. 1 Cor. 8: 6. Heb. 1: 10. See Excursus I. II.

3. "*Ος ὢν ἀπαύγασμα τῆς δόξης καὶ χαρακτὴρ τῆς ὑποστάσεως αὐτοῦ.* The ancient Greek commentators, and after them most of the modern ones, have applied these words to the *divine* nature of Christ. An examination of the imagery which they present, is necessary, in order to develope their real meaning.

'*Απαύγασμα* means *radiance, light flowing from a luminous body*, and is a derivate of *ἀπαυγάζω* i. q. *αὐγάζω, to shine, to emit splendour.* *Δόξα*, in classical Greek, means (1) *Opinion, sentiment, supposition, maxim.* (2) *Fame, honour, reputation.* But in our text, it plainly means the same as the Hebrew כָּבוֹד often does, viz. *splendour, brightness.* Comp. Luke 2: 9. 9: 31. Acts 22: 11. 7: 55. Matt. 6: 29. 1 Cor. 15: 41.

Χαρακτήρ is properly *an engraving* or *stamping instrument*, or, *a person who engraves* or *stamps.* But it is very commonly employed for the *figure itself*, or *image engraved* or *stamped*, e. g. upon coins, stones, metal, wood, or wax. So our English version, *express image*, i. e. image expressed or stamped. Hence, because the resemblance between the figure enstamped and the instrument by which it is enstamped, is so exact, *χαρακτήρ* means also, *exact image, resemblance*, or *delineation.*

'*Υπόστασις*, in the classical sense anciently attached to it, means (1) *Foundation, substratum, substructio.* (2) *Steadfastness, courage.* (3) *Purpose, resolution, determination.* (4) *Substance, essence, being.* In the sense of *person*, it first began to be used

by the Greek writers *after* the Arian controversy commenced. It was employed particularly in this way by Athanasius, in order that he might make a distinction between οὐσία and ὑπόστασις, while he maintained that the *persons* (προσώπα) in the Trinity were of one οὐσία, but yet were three ὑποστάσεις. The sense of *person*, then, being attached to this word long *after* the New Testament was written, it cannot be properly assigned to the word here. It plainly retains the more ancient meaning of *substance* or *essence*.

The nature of the imagery, presented by the two phrases in our verse, may be thus explained. If God be represented to us under the image of *splendour*, of *a luminary, the source of light;* then is Christ the *radiance of that splendour*, or *the light emitted from that luminary*. That is, as a luminous body becomes perceptible in consequence of the light radiated from it, so God has manifested or exhibited himself to us, in the person of his Son. To the same purpose, John says, "No man hath seen God at any time; the only begotten Son, who is in the bosom of the Father, he hath revealed him," John 1: 18. So again, "He that hath seen me, hath seen the Father," 14: 9; and again, "He that seeth me, seeth him that sent me," 12: 45. In Col. 1: 15, Christ is called "the image of the invisible God," i. e. he by whom the invisible God is, as it were, presented to our inspection. In him, God has exhibited to men the perfections of his character, i. e. has exhibited τὴν δόξαν αὐτοῦ, which word is figuratively used to designate the divine perfections. So 2 Cor. 4: 6, δόξης τοῦ θεοῦ ἐν προσώπῳ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, i. e. the divine perfections as displayed by Jesus Christ; a phrase of the like nature with that which I am endeavouring to explain.

Again; if God be represented under the image of ὑπόστασις, *substance, essence*, then is Christ the developement of that substance to our view; he is the *image, representation*, or *delineation* of it. As an image upon a coin presents the exact lineaments of the stamp which made it; so does Christ present the χαρακτήρ of the Father, he presents us with his likeness, i. e. reveals to us, in his person and work, just and proper views of the perfections of the Father. So, the old Syriac version renders ὑπόστασις αὐτοῦ by ܟܝܢܘܡܗ, i. e. his substance.

That both expressions are to be understood *figuratively*, is beyond all doubt; for God is not, in a *literal* sense, *splendour* or *a luminous substance;* nor is his ὑπόστασις, in itself considered, i. e.

physically or metaphysically considered, capable of being represented to our senses.

In the opinion, that the verse now under consideration relates to the incarnate Messiah, and not to the Logos in his divine nature simply considered, I find that Scott and Beza concur, not to mention others of the most respectable commentators. See Excursus III.

Φέρων . . . τῇ δυνάμεως αὐτοῦ, sustaining, i. e. guiding, managing, controlling, *the universe by his own powerful word.* So Chrysostom *φέρων, τουτέστι κυβερνῶν, τὰ διαπίπτοντα συγκρατῶν, governing, holding together that which is ready to fall asunder*, or, *preserving that which is ready to perish.* So Paul says of Christ, as *εἰκὼν τοῦ θεοῦ*, that *he is before all things, καὶ τὰ πάντα ἐν αὐτῷ συνέστηκε*, Col. 1: 17. *φέρων*, thus employed, corresponds to the Hebrew נָשָׂא, as used in Is. 46: 3. 66: 9, in the sense of *curo, conservo, to sustain and preserve*, as a mother does her child. The Greeks sometimes joined *φέρειν* and *ἄγειν* in the same phrase, in order to express the *administration of affairs. Τὰ πάντα* is a common expression in Greek, for the *universe.*

Τῷ ῥήματι τῆς δυνάμεως αὐτοῦ his own powerful word. Such a mode of expression is not, as Ernesti names it, properly Hebraism; for it is very common in all languages, although more frequent in the oriental than in the occidental tongues. *Αὐτοῦ*, sc. *ἑαυτοῦ* (not *αὐτοῦ*) that is, *by his own* powerful word, viz. the word of the Son, and not by the word of God, as *αὐτοῦ* would mean. The meaning of the whole phrase is, 'He directs and controls the universe by his omnipotent word.' It seems to be evidently an expression of the like nature with "God said, Let there be light and there was light, Gen. 1: 3;" also, "He spake, and it was done; he commanded, and it stood fast, Ps. 33: 9." In other terms, The Son has the universe at the control of his mere *word*; an expression signifying omnipotent, irresistible control. But, inasmuch as the universe was created by him (verse 2), it surely cannot appear strange, that he who made it should control it.

Δι' ἑαυτοῦ . . . τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν, having by himself made expiation for our sins. Καθαρισμός usually means *purification*; but in Hellenistic Greek, it is also employed for *expiation*; e. g. in Ex. 29: 36. 30: 10, the Seventy use it for the Hebrew כִּפֻּרִים, *atonement, expiation.* That *καθαρισμόν* cannot be used here in the

simple sense of *purification* by moral means, such as doctrine, etc. is evident from its being joined with *δι' ἑαυτοῦ*; which is explained in 2: 14, by *διὰ τοῦ θανάτου*; in 9: 12. by *διὰ τοῦ ἰδίου αἵματος*: and in 9: 26, by *διὰ τῆς θυσίας αὐτοῦ*. This last expression I regard as the *full* form, expressing what is elliptically expressed in our text by *δι' ἑαυτοῦ*.

After he had thus by the sacrifice of himself made expiation for sin, *ἐκάθισεν ἐν δεξιᾷ τῆς μεγαλωσύνης ἐν ὑψηλοῖς, he sat down at the right of the majesty on high*, i. e. of God in the highest heavens, *οὐρανοῖς* being understood after *ὑψηλοῖς*; or, *of supreme majesty*; (see Wahl Lex. on *οὐρανός*). The verb *ἐκάθισε* here corresponds to the Hebrew יָשַׁב, which applied to God, and to kings, does not mean simply *to sit*, but *to sit enthroned, to sit on a throne*; e. g. Ps. 2: 4, and often. *To sit on a throne*, or, *to sit at the right hand of one on a throne*, implies here, *commanding, ruling, judging*.

Μεγαλωσύνης means, *majesty, magnificence*, אַדֶּרֶת, גֹּדֶל, גְּדוּלָה. Here it is the *abstract* (as grammarians say) used for the *concrete*, i. e. on the right hand of the *majestic One*, or the *magnificent One*, viz. לִימִין אֱלֹהֵי הַכְּבוֹד. So Liber Enochi, (Fabricii Cod. Pseudep. V. T. p. 187), *ἐνώπιον τῆς δύξης τῆς μεγαλωσύνης*. See Excursus IV.

4. *Τοσούτῳ κρείττων ὄνομα, being exalted as much above the angels, as he has obtained an appellation more honourable than they. Κρείττων, praestantior, augustior, of higher rank* or *place, eminentior. Γενόμενος, constituted, rendered*, etc. It is here applied to the elevation of the Son to the *mediatorial* throne, after his death. *Διαφορώτερον, more eminent, more distinguished; παρ' αὐτούς, than they*, i. e. the angels. *Πυρά*, after the comparative degree, appears to be peculiar to this epistle. It makes of itself a comparative degree, as used in Rom. 1: 25. 14: 5. Heb. 1: 9. 2: 7. *Κεκληρονόμηκε, obtained, acquired*, as in verse 2d. *Ὄνομα*, either *name*, i. e. title as *υἱός*, or *rank, dignity*. Commentators are divided in opinion, respecting which of these meanings should be preferred. But the argument, in the sequel, shews that the title, SON, is the ground on which the superiority of Christ over the angels is proved. If it be objected that angels are also called *sons*; and men too; the answer is easy. No one *individual*, except Jesus, is ever called, by way of eminence, THE SON *of God*, i. e. the Messiah, or the king of Israel, John 1: 49.

The appeal is here made to Jewish readers of the Old Testament, who applied Ps. 2: 7, and 2 Sam. 7: 14, to the Messiah. In *such* a sense as in these passages, namely one that imported supreme dominion and authority, neither angels nor men were called *sons of God*. But Jesus bore this title, which, according to the Jewish Scriptures, was indicative of supreme dignity; and consequently he had an appellation of a more exalted nature than that of the angels, who are *servants* (1: 14), not *lords*.

5. *Τίνι γὰρ γεγέννηκά σε, for to which of the angels said he at any time, Thou art my Son; this day have I begotten thee? Γεγέννηκά σε* must of course be *figuratively* understood. But how? In Ps. II. the context shews that the expression here quoted has reference to Christ *as king*, as constituted king or lord over all; see vs. 6, 8, etc. *To beget*, is metaphorical language suited to the name *Son;* but as *Son* here plainly means *Messiah*, or the *anointed king*, dropping the metaphor, we come of course to the meaning, *constituted, made, appointed*, or *γενόμενος* as above.

In regard to *σήμερον*, which has been often construed as meaning, *from eternity*, Theodoret has plainly expressed its true sense; *οὐ τὴν αἰώνιον δηλοῖ γέννησιν, ἀλλὰ τὴν τῷ χρόνῳ συνεζευγμένην, it does not express his eternal generation, but that which is connected with time.* For surely Christ was exalted to the mediatorial throne in time, i. e. after his resurrection; and such an exaltation is the subject of description, in the second Psalm. Such a view of the meaning the context also demands, where his *acquired* condition is the particular subject of comparison with the rank and condition of the angels. So Chrysostom, after quoting v. 5, says, *ταῦτα εἴρηται μὲν εἰς τὴν σάρκα, this is spoken concerning his human nature.*

Ἐγὼ ἔσομαι εἰς υἱόν. In common Greek it would be, *ἐγὼ ἔσομαι πατὴρ αὐτοῦ υἱός μου.* The form of expression, *αὐτῷ εἰς πατέρα*, corresponds altogether to the Hebrew לוֹ לְאָב; and *μοὶ εἰς υἱόν*, to לִי לְבֵן, 2 Sam. 7: 14, whence the quotation is taken. The term, *Son*, seems here to designate one who should be entitled to all the rights and privileges of a Son; and in particular, one who should be an heir to the throne of his Father. This same figurative expression, *heirship, being heir*, the writer has applied to the Son in the context, vs. 2, 4. Now as the angels are not entitled to *such* privileges, the appellation *Son*, (which implies

a right to them in this case), shews that he to whom it is applied, is elevated above the angels. And this is the position, which the argument in Heb. 1. is designed to establish.

If we may credit Abarbanel, the ancient Jewish doctors held that the Messiah would be exalted above Abraham, Moses, and the angels. However this may be, the apostle in applying this and the following quotations to the Messiah, must have supposed himself addressing those, who would readily concede that they ought to be thus applied. Otherwise, we cannot suppose that he could have regarded this mode of reasoning as at all efficacious, or adapted to convince those to whom he wrote.

6. *"Οταν δὲ πάλιν λέγει, again also, when he bringeth his first begotten into the world, he saith;* a passage replete with difficulties. Does *πάλιν* qualify *εἰσαγάγῃ*? Or is it to be transposed thus, *πάλιν δὲ, ὅταν κ. τ. λ.*? Many contend for this transposition; and Abresch cites what he calls similar instances of a metathesis, in Acts 13: 27. 1 Cor. 4: 18. 2 Cor. 7: 6. These, however, come short of establishing his position. Admitting the transposition in question, we must translate *πάλιν, κ. τ. λ.* by, *again*, i. e. in another passage of Scripture, *when he introduces* etc. But this transposition is unnecessary, even if the sense here given to *πάλιν* be retained; for we may translate equally well, *but when, in another place, he introduces*, etc. One might translate *πάλιν* here, (with Storr, Wahl, and others), *on the other hand, on the contrary*, i. e. God speaks in quite a different way to the angels, when he introduces his first begotten into the world, viz. instead of calling them *sons*, he commands them *to worship his Son*. See Wahl's Lex. on *πάλιν*. So Schneider, *πάλιν, im Gegentheile, (ex adverso)*, specially in composites, as *παλίμφημος, contradictory*, etc. There is no ground for the sneer with which Schulz treats Storr's translation of *πάλιν* by *hingegen*, i. e. *ἐξ ἐναντίας*.

After all, however, I am more inclined to interpret *πάλιν* here as meaning, *again*, i. e. something in addition to what had been already said or stated. But as the position, which the writer has given it, is somewhat different from that of the preceding *καὶ πάλιν*, (which *commences* the clause or assertion in which it stands), I suppose the writer means to convey the idea, by using *δὲ πάλιν* in the latter case, that what he is going to suggest is only additional matter, and not simply additional Scriptural quotation. Certain it

is, that, on other occasions, where he cites several texts of Scripture continuously, he uses *καὶ πάλιν* in the same way before each citation; e. g. Heb. 2: 12, 13. The assertions of our author, (according to the views which I have of the use of *δὲ πάλιν* here), would run thus, 'God declares in the Scriptpture, that he has begotten the Messiah his Son; and again, that he is his Father, and the Messiah his Son; and *God has also said*, (which shews the superiority of Christ over the angels), that all the angels must worship him.' In this way all is natural and easy.

As another reason for translating as I have done, it may be added, that no direct antithesis, (between the declarations, that God had begotten the Messiah his Son, and that the latter was the Son of God the Father, contained in v. 5), is found in v. 6. This is a sufficient reason for avoiding here the translation which Storr, Wahl, and others, have given to *πάλιν*, viz. *ex adverso, hingegen* = *ἐξ ἐναντίας*. I have no doubt that *πάλιν* may have, and sometimes has, such a meaning; but it is unnecessary here, and on the whole, it is an improbable one.

Εἰσαγάγῃ κ. τ. λ. Does this mean, *to introduce to the world*, in the same sense as we now speak of introducing one *to* the world, i. e. *announcing him to them?* This is the common mode of interpretation. But some interpret *εἰσαγάγῃ* by *commend, producere et conspicuum facere*. Others, (with Chrysostom and Theophylact), *ὅταν ἐγχειρίσῃ αὐτῷ τὴν οἰκουμένην, when he delivers the world into his hands*, i. e. makes him king over all; a sense which *introducing to the world*, or *into the world*, will hardly bear. None of these interpretations seem to accord with the *usus loquendi* of the New Testament. *Εἰσαγαγεῖν εἰς τὴν οἰκουμένην* and *ἀποστέλλειν εἰς τὸν κόσμον*, are plainly phrases of equivalent import; and the latter is repeatedly used concerning Christ, John 3: 17. 10: 36, and employed to denote either his birth, or his appearing before the world in his public character. Such too is the Rabbinic usage of בְּעוֹלָם אתי. Comp. Heb. 10: 5. John 16: 28. 18: 37. 1: 9. It is not, then, an introduction of the Son to the world by *prophecy*, as expressed in the Old Testament, which is here spoken of; but an introduction in *fact*, i. e. his birth, or perhaps his entrance on his public office. It was at that time, as it would seem, that the angels received the command in question. Gregory Nyssen says, *καθὸ τὸ κτιστὸν ἤνοσεν ἑαυτῷ, εἰσαχθῆναι λέγεται εἰς τὴν κτίσιν, as he*

united that which was created with himself, he is said to be introduced into the creation ; cited by Theoph. in locum.

Καὶ προσκυνησάτωσαν αὐτῷ θεοῦ, let all the angels of God worship him. Compare with this, Luke 1: 11 seq., 1: 26 seq., in particular 2: 8 seq., where the angelic choir appear, and celebrate the birth of the Saviour. The *καί* here denotes, that the sentence quoted stood in connexion with something else which preceded it; but as this is not quoted also, the *καί* cannot well be translated.

If this exposition be admitted, (and it appears to be supported both by the *usus loquendi* of the New Testament and by fact), then we need not be very solicitous, whether the passage in Deut. 32: 43 (Sept.), or in Ps. 97: 7, is here quoted by the writer; nor whether either of them is quoted. See Excursus VI.

If I have rightly interpreted vs. 5 and 6, the meaning may be briefly expressed thus; 'Prediction in the Scripture assigned to the Son a rank above that of the angels, and occurrences at his birth demonstrate such to be the fact.'

7. *Καὶ πρὸς μὲν πυρός, moreover, with respect to the angels it is said, Who maketh his angels winds, and his ministering servants flaming fire ;* i. e. who maketh his angels that serve him the ministers of his will, as the winds and the lightning are. The Hebrew לֹהַט אֵשׁ, and Greek *πυρὸς φλόγα*, often mean *lightning ;* as plainly they do here. The whole phrase is susceptible of another interpretation; viz. who making his angels winds, i. e. swift as the winds, and his servants lightning, i. e. rapid, or terrible, or resistless as the lightning. But this does not suit the design for which the apostle quotes it, so well as the first interpretation. His object is to shew, that the angels are employed simply in a *ministerial* capacity; while the *Son* is *Lord of all.* Our English version, which has rendered רוּחוֹת (Ps. 104: 4) by *spirits*, gives an erroneous view of the meaning of the original.

Others construe the Hebrew original thus, *Who maketh the winds his messengers, and the lightnings his servants ;* and they defend this by alleging, that the context in the Psalm shews the design of the writer to be, only to declare the glory of God as displayed in the *visible* creation; and consequently, it is inapposite to suppose him here to be speaking of the *angels*, as an order of *invisible*, intelligent beings. But in Ps. 104: 1—3, the *invisible*

as well as *visible* majesty of God is described; and it is natural that the writer should proceed, and augment the force of his description, by introducing the angels as the ministering servants of the Deity. Besides, the Hebrew does not allow us properly to translate, *Who maketh the winds his angels* or *messengers*. In order to mean this, the Hebrew must be written עֹשֶׂה רוּחוֹת מַלְאָכָיו, and not (as now) עֹשֶׂה מַלְאָכָיו רוּחוֹת. See Heb. Gram. § 197, 3, and comp. in Ps. 104: 3. הַשָּׂם עָבִים רְכוּבוֹ, which surely cannot be rendered, "Who maketh his chariot clouds."

As to *λέγει*, in this verse, it is clear that the nominative cannot be *θεός*, for then the quotation would be in the *first* person, as it is in v. 5 above. The nominative, beyond all reasonable doubt, is *ἡ γραφή*, or *ὁ νόμος*. I have rendered *λέγει* in the passive voice, merely to avoid expressing the nominative, since the writer has not expressed it. To the same purpose Storr and Schulz, *heisst es, it is said*. So the usual appeal in the Mishna, נֶאֱמַר. Compare also, *φησί*, in 1 Cor. 6: 16. The quotation, in our verse, is from Ps. 104: 4.

8, 9. *Πρὸς δὲ τὸν υἱόν αἰώνιος, but respecting the Son, [he saith], Thy throne, O God, is eternal. Θρόνος* is plainly the emblem of *dominion;* because kings, when acting in their capacity as rulers, were accustomed to sit on thrones. *Ὁ θεός* is not the *nominative* case, as some have maintained, but the *vocative*. It is the usual vocative, and nearly the only form of it, throughout the Septuagint; e. g. Ps. 3: 7. 4: 1. 5: 10. 7: 1, et passim. The Attics, moreover, frequently retain the form of the nominative, in the vocative of the second declension. Buttmann's Gram. § 33. n. 2. To translate the phrase by, *God is thy throne*, would be to introduce a mode of expression foreign to the *usus loquendi* of the Scriptures; for where is God ever said to be the *throne of his creatures?* And what could be the sense of such an expression? *Throne* is the emblem of *dominion*, not of *support*. So Theoph., *Θρόνος γὰρ ὁ βασιλείας σύμβολον*. Figuratively used, as here, it is of the same import as *sceptre*, *ῥάβδος*. Gesenius renders the phrase, *thy God's throne is eternal*, i. e. the throne which God gives thee. But this is doing violence to כִּסְאֲךָ אֱלֹהִים, which to support his rendering should be, כִּסְא אֱלֹהֶיךָ, the pronoun following the second of two nouns in regimen, according to the usual custom, Heb. Gram. § 185. 1.

Ῥάβδος εὐθύτητος σου, a sceptre of justice is the sceptre of thy kingdom, or, *thy reign is just.* The former clause designates the perpetuity of the Son's reign; the present one, its equitable nature. It is quite plain, too, that the two clauses are a poetic parallelism, as they belong to Ps. 45: 7; and also that the subject of both clauses is the same, viz. the dominion or reign of the Son or Messiah.

Ἠγάπησας . . . ἀνομίαν, thou hast loved righteousness and hated iniquity, i. e. thou hast administered the affairs of thy government in a manner altogether just; or, thine equity is highly conspicuous. Such a negative form of expression (*καὶ ἐμίσησας ἀνομίαν*), following an affirmative one, is very common in the Scriptures, and is designed to give intensity to the affirmative assertion which precedes it. Comp. John 1: 3, 20. et al. saepe.

Διὰ τοῦτο ἀγαλλιάσεως, because of this, O God, thy God has anointed thee with the oil of gladness. But the phrase is equally susceptible of the rendering, *God, thy God, has anointed thee*, etc; and this without any alteration of the general sense of the passage. Theophylact, however, thought otherwise; for he says "*ὁ θεὸς, ἀντὶ τοῦ ὦ θεέ ἐστι*, as our enemy Symmachus (here a credible witness) affirms, who renders the Hebrew thus, *θεέ, ὁ θεός σου.*"

Ἔλαιον ἀγαλλιάσεως, i. e. *κατ' ἔλαιον.* Kings were anointed with oil, in order to consecrate them to their office; see Ps. 2: 6. 1 Sam. 10: 1. 16: 13. But perfumed oil, or precious ointment, was often employed also on festive occasions; and honoured guests at an entertainment were often bedewed with it. That *ἔλαιον ἀγαλλιάσεως* here does not mean the *oil of consecration to office*, is plain from the consideration, that the administration of the kingly office is described, in the preceding context, as having already existed. The meaning then must be, 'God has exalted his *Son*, with honour greater than that bestowed on kings,' or, 'bestowed a higher joy on him than on *other kings*.'

Παρὰ τοὺς μετόχους σου, lit. *in comparison with thine associates*, i. e. in office, viz. kings. God has bestowed a higher reward, a greater honour on the king Messiah, than on any other kings.

Thus much for the *words*. The general *sentiment* remains to be stated. The words are quoted from Ps. 45: 6, 7. That this whole psalm relates to the Messiah, has been generally believed by

Jewish and Christian commentators; and it is at last acknowledged by Rosenmueller, in the second edition of his *Comm. in Psalmos.* All other explanations seem liable to insuperable difficulties; and this, one may hope, will soon be universally felt and acknowledged.

That the whole Psalm relates to the Messiah, however, as *mediatorial* king, can scarcely be doubted by any one who compares together all its different parts. This king is called אֱלֹהִים, θεός. Does the word θεός here denote the *divine*, or the *kingly* nature or condition of the Messiah? Most interpreters, who admit the doctrine of the Saviour's divine nature, contend for the first of these senses; as I have myself once done, in a former publication. But further examination has led me to believe, that there are grounds to doubt of such an application of the word θεός, in this passage. The king, here called θεός, has for himself a θεός; "*thy God* hath anointed *thee.*" The same king has *associates* (μετόχους), i. e. others who in some respects are in a similar condition or office. As *divine*, who are μέτοχοι with the Saviour? Besides, his equity, his government, his state, as described in Ps. XLV., are all such as belong to the *king Messiah.* Now as *Elohim* is a title sometimes given to kings or magistrates, as one may see in Ps. 82: 1, 6. comp. John 10: 35, (in Ex. 7: 1 and 4: 16, it is a different case), although no one individual king or magistrate is ever called simply *Elohim*, may not this title be applied, in a sense altogether *peculiar* and *preeminent*, to the Messiah as king; designating his great superiority over all other kings, and distinguishing him as σύνθρονος with God, as 'King of kings, and Lord of lords?' Rev. 17: 14. Comp. Heb. 1: 3, and the note on ἐκάθισεν ἐν δεξιᾷ κ. τ. λ. Such an explanation, to say the least, removes some of the difficulties which attend the usual one; while the following verses leave no just room to doubt what was the opinion of the writer of our epistle, in regard to the divine nature of the Messiah.

The *perpetuity* of the kingdom mentioned here, may be the same as that in Luke 1: 33; with which is to be compared 1 Cor. 15: 24—28. Indeed, it must be such, allowing the kingdom of the Messiah to be the one which is here meant.

10. *Καὶ, σὺ κατ' ἀρχάς ἐθεμελίωσας, also, Thou Lord in the beginning didst lay the foundation of the earth.* This verse is, by construction, necessarily connected with the preceding ones;

v. 7, *καὶ πρὸς μὲν τοὺς ἀγγέλους λέγει*—v. 8, *πρὸς δὲ τὸν υἱὸν* [*λέγει*]—v. 10, *καὶ* [i. e. *πρὸς τὸν υἱὸν λέγει*]. An address to Jehovah here, considered simply as creator, is utterly irrelevant to the scope of the writer, and to the object which he evidently has in view. Both the grammatical construction, and the plain design of the passage, unite in declaring this.

Κατ' ἀρχάς, in the Hebrew, Ps. 102: 25, it is לְמָיִם, *of old, formerly*, equivalent to בְּרֵאשִׁית in Gen. 1: 1. *Κύριε*, in the New Testament and Septuagint, corresponds both to יְהוָה and אֲדֹנָי or אֱלֹהִים, in the Hebrew. Here it corresponds to אֲדֹנָי, in Ps. 102: 24. *Ἐθεμελίωσας, thou hast laid the foundation; θεμελιόω*, applied to a building, has this sense. But here it is, of course, applied in a figurative manner, to designate the original and primary act of creation, (so to speak); viz. that act which may be compared to what a workman does, when he lays the foundation of a building. The Son, therefore, did not merely arrange or set in order the materials of creation already brought into being, but laid the foundation of the universe, i. e. performed the original act or first work, viz. that of bringing it into being.

Ἔργα τῶν χειρῶν σου, מַעֲשֵׂה יָדֶיךָ, *the work of thy hands*, i. q. thy work. The phrase is borrowed from the fact, that *hands* are the instruments by which men usually perform any operation; and this is, like other human operations and affections, figuratively transferred to God. *Οἱ οὐρανοί* means, all parts of the creation except the earth; see Gen. 1: 1. The Hebrews designated the sun, moon, and stars, i. e. all the visible creation besides the earth, by the word שָׁמַיִם, *heavens*.

11. *Αὐτοί, they*, i. e. the heavens and the earth. *Σὺ δὲ διαμένεις*, (Hebrew תַּעֲמֹד) *thou shalt continue, be permanent, stand fast.* It is the opposite of *ἀπολοῦνται*. *Παλαιωθήσονται, shall wax old*, a word which, applied to a garment (the image here used) means, *to go into a state of decay* or *desuetude, to become unfit for use.* Hence the metaphorical language that follows.

12. *Καὶ ὡσεὶ . . . αὐτούς, and as a vesture shalt thou fold them up. Ἑλίξεις* means, *to fold up, to roll together.* The heavens are often represented as an *expanse* (רָקִיעַ), and *rolling them up* is, of course, *to remove* them. The language, however, in the case before us, is borrowed from the custom of *folding up* and *laying aside* garments, which have become unfit for use. The Hebrew

word (for which ἑλίξεις is put) is תַּחֲלִיף, *thou shalt change, remove.* Ἀλλαγήσονται, *they shall decay, they shall be changed,* i. e. removed, taken away, or *shall pass away,* Hebrew יַחֲלֹפוּ, Ps. 102: 26. Comp. 2 Pet. 3: 10. Is. 51: 6, also 34: 4, where the image is fully presented. Σὺ δὲ ὁ αὐτὸς εἶ, (Hebrew וְאַתָּה הוּא), *thou art he,* viz. who liveth for ever, *thou art always the same.* So the sequel leads us to interpret this. Τὰ ἔτη σου οὐκ ἐκλείψουσι, *thy years shall never cease* or *fail,* i. e. shall never come to an end.

This would be true, if it was spoken merely with reference to the future, and should be construed as having respect only to eternity *a parte post,* as it is technically called, i. e. eternity to come. But as it stands here, in connexion with having created the heavens and the earth κατ' ἀρχάς, it can hardly be understood to mean less than absolute eternity, or eternity *a parte ante et a parte post.* See Excursus VII.

13. Πρὸς τίνα δὲ τῶν ἀγγέλων δεξιῶν μου, *unto which of the angels, also, has he ever said, sit at my right hand.* That is, where is any example of his addressing any one of the angels, and asking him *to sit at his right hand,* i. e. to be σύνθρονος with him? See on δεξιᾷ μεγαλοσύνης, under v. 3 above.

Ἕως ἂν θῶ ποδῶν σου, *until I shall make thine enemies thy footstool,* i. e. reduce them to the most entire subjection. These words are quoted from Ps. 110: 1 (Sept. 109. 1), and are applied to the Messiah. *To make enemies a footstool,* is an expression borrowed from the custom, in ancient times, of treading upon the necks of captives and captive kings, on the occasion of celebrating a triumph over them, and in token of their complete prostration and subjection; see Joshua 10: 24, and so often in Homer. *Enemies* signifies all such as are opposed to the doctrines or duties of the Christian religion. In Ps. 110: 1, the Messiah is invited *to sit at the right hand of God,* (i. e. at his right hand on his throne, comp. Rev. 3: 21), *until* (עַד, ἕως ἄν) *his enemies should be utterly subdued.* But what follows this period, when they shall have been thus subdued? The apostle has told us. It is the *mediatorial* throne to which the Messiah is exalted; it is to him as *constituted* king, that his enemies are to be brought in subjection; and when this is accomplished, the *mediatorial* throne and reign, *as such,* are to cease. So 1 Cor. 15: 24—28 seems to assure us.

14. How different the station and employment of angels, from

that of the Messiah! He is *σύνθρονος* with God, and commands the universe; they are spirits employed merely as ministers to execute his will. Are they not all *λειτουργικὰ πνεύματα*? Comp. 1 K. 22: 19. Zech. 3: 5—7. Dan. 7: 10. Is. 6: 1. Luke 1: 19. By the Rabbins, the angels are frequently named מַלְאֲכֵי רָשֵׁרוּתָא, *angeli ministerii*. *Εἰς διακονίαν, for ministering, in order to serve*, i. e. assist. *Διακονία* means, *any kind of service* or *assistance* whatever. It is here said to be performed, *διὰ τοὺς μέλλοντας κληρονομεῖν σωτηρίαν, on account of those who are to obtain salvation*, i. e. on account of Christians who are the heirs of future glory or happiness, or, who will obtain it.

Whatever may be the opinion of some modern critics, in regard to the real existence of angels as intelligent beings; it appears quite clear, that the writer of our epistle regarded them as such. To have instituted a comparison between the Son of God, on the one hand, and mere *abstract qualities* or *imaginary beings*, on the other, would not seem to be very apposite, at least not apposite to any serious purpose. And if the writer looked upon angels as only *imaginary* beings, or personifications of qualities, with what propriety or consistency could he represent them as worshipping the Son of God, or as ministering to the saints? But Ps. 102: 3, is first erroneously translated, *He maketh the winds his angels, and flaming fire his servants, λειτουργοὺς αὐτοῦ*, and it is then used as a proof, that the *elements* themselves are called *angels*. Hence it is concluded, that it is unnecessary to suppose angels to be an order of *real, intelligent beings*. But as this translation is not well grounded, (see on v. 7th), any such conclusion built upon it cannot be stable. That the sacred writers every where regard angels, and speak of them, as intelligent beings, having a *real* existence, appears so plain, that it would seem as if no one who is not strongly wedded to his own *a priori* and philosophical reasoning, could venture to deny it.

CHAP. II.

1. *Διὰ τοῦτο, on this account, therefore*, i. e. since Christ, who is at the head of the new dispensation, is so much exalted above the angels who were the mediators of the old (see v. 2), *it becomes us*, etc. *Ἡμᾶς, us* by *κοινωσις*, i. e. a method of speaking in which

the writer includes himself with those whom he addresses. See Heb. 1: 1. 2: 3. 3: 1, 14. 4: 2, etc. See also similar cases in 1 Cor. 10: 8, 9. 2 Cor. 7: 1. Acts 16: 17, et alibi.

Προσέχειν is elliptical, (*προσέχειν τὸν νοῦν* is the full expression), and means, *attendere, to give heed to.* Abresch thinks it is here equivalent to *ἀντέχεσθαι, retinere, tenaciter adhaerere;* which Dindorf also favours. But evidently this is unnecessary, inasmuch as *περισσοτέρως* is connected with it, and designates the *intensity* of mind, with which attention should be paid to the things that the Son of God reveals. *Ἀκουσθεῖσι, things heard,* are the truths and doctrines of the Christian religion, which had been declared to them, see vs. 3, 4.

Παραῤῥυῶμεν, a long contested and difficult word. Two senses have been principally contended for; (1) *To fall, to stumble,* or *to perish.* This latter sense Chrysostom and Theophylact give it; *παραῤῥυῶμεν, τουτέστι, ἀπολώμεθα, ἐκπέσωμεν.* Both illustrate it by the proverbial saying, addressed to a child, *υἱέ, μὴ παραῤῥυῇς,* Prov. 3: 21, in order to guard him against stumbling. In like manner Theodoret represents the word as spoken here, *ἵνα μή τινα ὄλισθον ὑπομείνωμεν, so that we may not suffer a lapse,* or, *may not stumble, fall.* So Suidas explains it by *παραπέσωμεν*; Hesych. by *ἐκπέσωμεν*; Lex. Cyrilli, *μὴ παραῤῥυῇς, μὴ ἐκπέσῃς, μὴ παρασύρῃς.* The Syriac and Arabic interpreters have rendered it, *that we may not fall.* Alberti and Matthiae, with many modern critics, assign to it the same sense. The idea connected with *stumbling, falling,* by this class of commentators, is not that of *transgression,* but of *punishment,* of *destruction;* as is evident from the whole of their illustrations, when compared each with himself and with the others.

But, although this view of the word has been often given, none of the passages adduced from the Greek writers, and alleged to justify it, seem adequate for this purpose. Wetstein has collected a large number of passages, which contain the word in question. But most of them, are only such as designate the well known senses of the word *παραῤῥύω,* viz. *to flow, to flow by;* as *τῷ παρὰ πόλιν παραῤῥέοντι ποταμῷ* (Plutarch); *πιεῖν ἀπὸ τοῦ παραῤῥέοντος ποταμοῦ* (Xen.); *to flow into,* as *παραῤῥυεὶς εἰς τὸ στόμα ἰδρώς* (Galen); in all which cases the word is applied to the flowing of *liquids: to flow out,* as *εἴ τις ἀφροδίσιος λόγος παραῤῥυῇ*

(Ælian). In some cases the word is figuratively applied to locomotion in men; as *παραῤῥυεὶς γὰρ ἄνθρωπος εἰς τὸν νεὼν* [*ναὸν*] *τοῦ Ἀσκληπιοῦ* (Plutarch). None of these instances justify the sense of *perishing, falling into ruin.*

2. The other sense contended for, is that of *suffering to flow from the mind* or *memory*, i. e. *to forget.* That *παραῤῥυεῖν* is frequently applied to things that glide or pass away from the mind, is well established. E. g. "Many, who seem to be believers, ... need, for the sake of remembering, ... examples drawn from objects of sense *ἵνα μὴ τέλεον παραῤῥυῇ, so that they will not entirely escape*, i. e. from the mind, Origen contra Celsum, p. 393." "That *τὰ καλὰ* may not be merely temporary, *καὶ μὴ παραῤῥυῇ λήθης βυθοῖς ἀμαυρουμένα, and may not escape* [flow away], being obscured in the abysses of forgetfulness, Greg. Nazianz." So Lucian, *εἴ τι ἐν τῷ ποιήσεως δρόμῳ παραῤῥυὲν λάθῃ, if any thing flowing away* [escaping] *in the poetic course is forgotten*, Diss. cum Hesiod. 5. So in Latin, "frustra docemur, si quidquid audimus *praeterfluat* [*παραῤῥυεῖ*], Quinctil. XI. 2." "It cannot enter into the mind of the judge, ante enim *praeterlabitur* quam percepta est, for *it glides away* before it is apprehended, Cicero de Orat. II. 25."

But in all these cases, *παρῤῥυῶ* is applied only to *things*, and not to *persons.* That a thing *παραῤῥυῇ, should escape* from me, and that *I* should be said *παραῤῥυεῖν* in respect to that thing, are two very different expressions; and consequently, all the instances above, which have been adduced by learned critics, do not meet the difficulty of the case. *Παραῤῥυῶμεν* is applied, in our text, to *persons*, not (as here) to *things.*

In the classics, I have been able to find no example, which is in point for our case. The Septuagint have used the word but once, Prov. 3: 21, *υἱέ, μὴ παραῤῥυῇς, τήρησον δὲ ἐμὴν βουλὴν καὶ ἔννοιαν, Son, do not pass by* [neglect], *but keep my counsel and advice.* This is the very proverb to which Chrysostom and Theophylact appeal, as an illustration of the word in question; but the true sense of this word, in Prov. 3: 21, they do not seem to have apprehended. *Παραῤῥυῇς* here plainly does not mean to *perish, to fall*, but it is the antithesis of *τήρησον, keep, attend to, practice*, and consequently means, *to pass by, to neglect, to transgress.* In like manner Clemens Alex., speaking of women, says, "They are bound

by virtuous modesty, *ἵνα μὴ παραῤῥυῶσι τῆς ἀληθείας διὰ χαυνότητα, not to neglect* [pass by, transgress] the truth on account of effeminate weakness Pedagog. III. p. 246." These two instances seem to meet the wants of our case, as *παραῤῥυῶ* is here applied to *persons*.

The sense which our passage demands, is better made out by following these examples, than in any other way. The writer of our epistle does not design to say, in chap. 2: 1, *Take heed, or you will perish;* for he speaks of *punishment* immediately after, in 2: 2. The explanation of Chrysostom, then, and of the great number of critics who have followed him, is rendered improbable by the nature of the context, and it is unsupported by any classic example in point. The other explanation, *lest we should let them slip, lest we should not retain them, lest they should glide away*, is an approximation to the right meaning of the word. Plainly *μὴ παραῤῥυῶμεν*, here applied to *persons*, means, *lest we should pass by*, viz. the things which we have heard, *lest we should neglect them, lest we should transgress* [pass beyond] *them;* for so the writer himself has explained it, in the context. *For if*, says he, *every παράβασις and παρακοὴ received a due reward* [under the law of Moses], *how shall we escape punishment, ἀμελήσαντες, having neglected so great salvation.* That *ἀμελήσαντες* here refers to the same thing which is designated by *παραῤῥυῶμεν*, is quite clear; for first, the writer exhorts them 'to attend diligently to what they had heard, lest they should *pass by* or *neglect* it;' and then he says, 'if they *do neglect* it (*ἀμελήσαντες*), punishment will be the certain consequence, a punishment more severe than that inflicted on transgressors under the law.'

The same sentiment is obtained, if we compare *παραῤῥυῶμεν* with the preceding *περισσοτέρως προσέχειν*, of which it is plainly the opposite or antithesis. Now as *προσέχειν* means, *to attend diligently, to give heed*, so *παραῤῥυῶμεν* must mean, (as its antithesis), *not to attend diligently*, i. e. *to treat with neglect, to be ἀμελήσαντες*, as it is expressed in the following verse. In a word, the sentiment is, '*diligent* attention to the truths of the gospel is necessary to guard us against *neglect* or *transgression;* which neglect is followed by certain and aggravated condemnation.

If an apology be due for dwelling so long on the verbal criticism of this word, it is, that the word has been so long contested, and so unsatisfactorily illustrated.

2. *Εἰ γὰρ ὁ δι' ἀγγέλων λαληθεὶς λόγος, if the communication* [revelation] *made by angels.* The *Jewish law* is undoubtedly the *λόγος δι' ἀγγέλων λαληθείς*, in this case. The meaning is, that angels were present and assisted, at the giving of the law. See Excursus VIII.

Ἐγένετο βέβαιος, was ratified, was made firm and stable, i. e. its threatenings and promises were exactly fulfilled; nothing which the law declared was null, or failed of being carried into execution. Comp. Rom. 4: 16. Heb. 9: 17. 2 Pet. 1: 19.

Καὶ πᾶσα παράβασις καὶ παρακοή, every transgression and act of disobedience. The words are nearly or quite synonymous by usage, both of them being employed in a secondary or derived sense. *Παράβασις* (from *παραβαίνω*), literally, *going beyond, passing by* any thing, is here applied to a *moral* action. So *παρακοή* comes from *παρακούω*, which means, first, *to hear in a careless or negligent manner;* and secondly, *to disobey*, i. e. it is the opposite of *ἀκούω to hear*, and, *to obey. Παράβασις καὶ παρακοή* taken together mean, *every kind of transgression*, or, *every kind of offence against the law.*

Ἔνδικον μισθαποδοσίαν, just retribution, or, *condign punishment. Μισθαποδοσία* designates the reward of retributive justice, i. e. punishment, as well as the reward for virtuous conduct; and this, in heathen as well as sacred writers.

3. *Πῶς ἡμεῖς ἐκφευξόμεθα, how shall we escape?* viz. escape the *μισθαποδοσίαν* reserved for transgressors. Comp. Heb. 12: 25. So Rom. 2: 3, *ἐκφεύγειν τὸ κρίμα τοῦ Θεοῦ*. So Aesch. Eumen. v. 756, *ἐκφεύγειν αἵματος δίκην.*

Τηλικαύτης σωτηρίας, i. e. the Christian religion; for so the word *σωτηρία* sometimes signifies. Comp. Jude v. 3, perhaps Rom. 11: 11, and Heb. 6: 9. The full phrase would seem to be *ὁ λόγος τῆς σωτηρίας*, which is found in Acts 13: 26. It is, however, the Christian religion with all its promised blessings and tremendous threats, which is here designated by *σωτηρία*. How can we escape with impunity, *if we neglect* (*ἀμελήσαντες*) them? *Ἀμελήσαντες* here means more than simple *neglect;* it is plainly emphatic in this connexion, and means, *to treat with utter disregard* or *contempt*, such namely as would be implied in apostasy.

Ἥτις ἀρχὴν λαβοῦσα λαλεῖσθαι, equivalent to *ἐν ἀρχῇ λαληθεῖσα, which was at first declared* or *published.* The Greeks often

use the phrase *ἀρχὴν λαβών*, for, *at first*, or *taking its rise, commencing its origin*. *Τοῦ Κυρίου*, viz. Christ.

Ὑπὸ τῶν ἀκουσάντων εἰς ἡμᾶς ἐβεβαιώθη, was confirmed unto us by those who heard [him], i. e. the Lord, or, *by those who heard* [it], i. e. the gospel, *σωτηρίαν*. *Ἐβεβαιώθη* here means *delivered* or *declared with confirmation to us*, i. e. Christians. So Theophylact, *διεπορθμεύθη εἰς ἡμᾶς βεβαίως καὶ πιστῶς, was propagated to us surely and faithfully*. Because the writer here says *εἰς ἡμᾶς*, some critics draw the conclusion, that Paul could not have been the author of this epistle, since he received the gospel immediately from Christ himself, Gal. 1: 12, and not from those who heard the Saviour declare it. But who that reads his writings with care, can fail to observe how often he employs *κοίνωσις*, when addressing Christians? Cicero says, in one of his orations, *nos perdimus rempublicam*. Shall we conclude that he did not write the oration, because he did not himself destroy the republic? See on *ἡμᾶς*, under v. 1, and also Introduction, § 27. no. 17.

4. *Συνεπιμαρτυροῦντος τοῦ Θεοῦ σημείοις τε καὶ τέρασι, God attesting, being co-witness*, viz. to the truth of what was preached, *by various wonderful events*. *Σημεῖον*, as used often in the New Testament and in the Septuagint, means, *any extraordinary sign* or *miraculous event*, designed to shew the certainty that something which had been promised or predicted should take place, or that a prophet was what he professed to be. *Τέρας, portentum, prodigium, miracle*, has nearly the same meaning, and is very commonly joined with *σημεῖον*, in the New Testament. Both connected mean, *various extraordinary events* or *prodigies*, designed to confirm, establish, or render credible, any prediction or declaration of Christ, or of his messengers. Heathen writers sometimes employ both words in connexion; e. g. Aelian, Var. Hist. XII. 57. The corresponding Hebrew phrase is, אֹתוֹת וּמוֹפְתִים, *signs and wonders*, i. e. wonderful signs or proofs of any thing. Such the people of God often required, and such were often given. See Gen. 15: 8—18. 24: 12—27. Judges 6: 17, 21, 36—40. 2 K. 19: 29. Is. 38: 7, 8. 7: 14—16, et alibi. Comp. Matt. 12: 38. 16: 1—3.

Καὶ ποικίλαις δυνάμεσι, and various miraculous powers. Sometimes *δύναμις* is put for *miracle*, as Matt. 7: 22. 11: 20, 21, 23, et alibi. But as *σημείοις καὶ τέρασι* denote *miraculous events*, in our verse, I understand *δυνάμεσι* as referring here to the *miraculous pow-*

ers which were imparted to the primitive teachers of the Christian religion. In such a sense the word is employed, in Mark 6: 14. Acts 6: 8. 10: 38. The Septuagint do not employ this word to translate either אוֹת or מוֹפְתִים, but always use *σημεῖον* and *τέρατα*.

What follows, is connected with the phrase just explained; viz. *καὶ πνεύματος ἁγίου μερισμοῖς*, literally, *and distributions of the Holy Spirit*, i. e. the imparting of divine influence; which refers particularly to the species of this influence, which consisted in the power of working miracles. See 1 Cor. 12: 6—11. Comp. also John 7: 39. Acts 1: 5, 8. 2: 4, 17, 18, 33. 5: 32. 8: 15—19. 10: 44—47. 19: 1—6.

Ποικίλαις δυνάμεσι.... καὶ μερισμοῖς, if considered as a Hendyadis (*ἓν διὰ δυοῖν*), may be thus rendered, *various miraculous powers, imparted by divine influence.* But I rather prefer the rendering which I have given it in the version, as *μερισμοὶς* probably designates the additional gifts of the Spirit, other than miraculous powers.

Κατὰ τὴν αὐτοῦ θέλησιν, as it seemed good in his [God's] *sight, as he pleased;* or, *as the Holy Spirit pleased*, which last is favoured by 1 Cor. 12: 6—11.

The sum of the whole warning (vs. 1—4) is, 'Beware that ye do not slight the gospel, whose threatenings are more to be dreaded than those of the law; inasmuch as the gospel is a revelation of a higher nature, and has been confirmed by more striking and more abundant miracles, wrought by divine power.'

The writer, after having thus stopped for a moment to warn his readers against the consequences of defection from Christianity, returns to his subject, viz., the comparison of Christ with the angels. Having established, by appeals to the Old Testament, (1: 5—14), the superiority of the former over the latter, in several points of view; he now proceeds to shew, that the new or Christian dispensation was not ordered or arranged (like the Mosaic one) by angels, but that the Son of Man, the Messiah, was, in his human nature, placed at the head of it. Now as the Jews, one and all, conceded that the dispensation of the Messiah would be of a higher order than that of Moses, proof that Jesus was the sole mediator or head of the new dispensation, and that angels were not employed as mediators or *intermuntii* in it, would satisfy them that Jesus was superior to the angels; since the place which he holds in the *new* economy, is higher than that which they had under the *old*, because the new economy itself is of a higher nature than the old. At the same time, an objection, which a Jew, weak in Christian faith and strong in his attachment to the Mosaic institutions, would very naturally feel, is met, and tacitly answered by the apostle, in what follows. The unbelieving Jews doubtless urged upon those who professed an attachment to Christianity, the seeming absurdity of renouncing their subjection to a dispensation of which angels were the mediators, and of acknowledging a subjection to one of which the professed head and mediator appeared in our nature. The history of the objections made by the unbelieving Jews, to the claims of Jesus as being the Son of God (John 10: 30—39 et alibi), shews how very repulsive it was to their feelings, that one to all

appearance like a man, and made up of flesh and blood in the same manner as themselves, should advance a claim to the exalted honours of a superior and divine nature. The sects of the Nazarenes and Ebionites, which arose even in the apostolic age from professed Jewish Christians in Palestine, shew how prone the Jewish Christians were, to feel doubts and difficulties about the claims of Jesus to a nature higher than the human, and to which divine honours were due.

No wonder, then, that the apostle found it necessary to meet, in our epistle, those doubts and difficulties with regard to the superior nature of the Christian dispensation, which were urged upon the minds of Jewish converts, by the unbelieving Jews who regarded Christ as a mere man. We shall see, however, that our author disposes of this difficulty, so as to further the great purpose of his general argument.

He concedes the fact entirely, that Jesus had a nature truly and properly human, v. 6—18. But instead of granting that this proves the new dispensation to be inferior to that of Moses, he proceeds to adduce evidence from the Old Testament Scriptures, to shew that man, or the human nature in the person of the Messiah, should be made Lord of the universe. Consequently, in this nature, Jesus the Messiah is superior to the angels. Of course, the possession by Jesus of a nature truly and properly human, does not at all prove either his inferiority, or the inferiority of the dispensation of which he is the head (v. 6—9); which meets an objection strongly urged upon the Hebrew Christians, by their unbelieving brethren.

Nay more; it was becoming that God should exalt Jesus, in consequence of his obedience unto death; a *death* necessary for the salvation of Jew and Gentile, v. 9. 10. To suffer this death, he must needs take on him a nature like ours; and, as his object was the salvation of *men*, (and not of *angelic beings*), so he participated in the nature of men, in order that by *experience* he might know their sufferings, temptations, and trials, and thus be prepared, in a peculiar manner and in their own nature, to be compassionate, faithful, and ready to succour them, v. 11—18.

The sum of the whole is; 'The possession of a human nature by Jesus, is far from being a reason, why the ancient dispensation (of which angels were the *intermunii*) is preferable to the new one; for (1) This very nature is exalted far above the angels. (2) Without participating in this nature, Jesus could not have made expiation for sin by his death. And (3) The possession of such a nature did contribute, in a peculiar and endearing manner, to constitute him such a Saviour as men could approach with the greatest boldness and confidence, in all their wants and all their woes.'

Such appears to be the course of reasoning and thought, in Heb. II. The words and phrases remain to be explained.

5. *Τὴν οἰκουμένην τὴν μέλλουσαν*, equivalent to *ὁ αἰὼν ὁ μέλλων*, i. e. *the Christian dispensation*, the world as it will be in future, *ὁ μέλλων*, i. e. the world under the reign of Christ. See Wahl, on the word *αἰών*. The addition of the writer, *περὶ ἧς λαλοῦμεν*, shews that such is the sense of the phrase; for it is *Christianity*, to which he had just been urging the Hebrews to pay the strictest regard.

6. *Διεμαρτύρατο δέ που τις, one in a certain place*, i. e. passage of Scripture, *bears this testimony*. The writer speaks to those who were supposed to be familiar with the Jewish Scriptures, and who needed only a reference to them, by quoting some of the words which any passage contained in order that they might be found. For a Hebrew to acknowledge the *authority* of his own Scriptures, might be expected as a matter of course. The passage quoted here is Ps. 8: 4—6, exactly according to the version of the Seventy.

Τί ἐστιν ἄνθρωπος, ὅτι μιμνήσκῃ αὐτοῦ; what is man that thou shouldest kindly remember him? The secondary sense of *μιμνήσκω* is, *to remember with affection, to treat with kindness.* So the Heb. זָכַר; and so *μιμνήσκεσθε*, in Heb. 13: 3.

Ἢ υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου, ὅτι ἐπισκέπτῃ αὐτόν, or the son of man, that thou shouldest regard him! The phrase *υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου*, is equivalent to *ἄνθρωπος*; just as in Hebrew, בֶּן אָדָם is equivalent to אָדָם. The subject is evidently the same as in the preceding clause, and *υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου* is employed merely for the sake of giving variety to the mode of expression. *Ἐπισκέπτομαι, to visit*, is usually, *to inspect* or *look upon favourably, to watch over one* for his good, *to succour* him, *to assist* him. See Matt. 25: 36. Luke 1: 68. James 1: 27. In the New Testament, it is used only in a sense which designates *inspecting with an eye of favour.* But in the Septuagint it is also used for, *visiting in order to punish;* as is the Hebrew פָּקַד, e. g. Ex. 32: 34. 34: 7, et alibi. Our English word *regard*, (taken in a good sense), answers well to *ἐπισκέπτομαι.* The *classical* use of the word sometimes, though rarely, accords with the sense in which it is here employed.

7. *Ἠλάττωσας αὐτὸν βραχύ τι παρ' ἀγγέλους, thou hast made him but little inferior to the angels. Παρά* here means, *in comparison with;* as in 1: 4 *παρ' αὐτούς. Βραχύ τι* may signify either *a little time*, or, *a little in respect to degree* or *rank;* in which last case, it would be equivalent here to our English word *somewhat.* In the Septuagint it is employed in both these senses; as is also the Hebrew word מְעַט, which is here rendered by *βραχύ τι.* In Ps. 8: 6, מְעַט seems pretty plainly to refer to *inferiority of rank* or *station*, and not to *time.* But in our text, most recent commentators have maintained that it refers to *time;* and consequently, that the apostle has merely *accommodated* the passage in Ps. VIII. to an expression of his own views. But such a mode of interpretation is, at least, unnecessary here. The object which the writer of our epistle has in view, is not to prove how little time Christ appeared in our nature; but that, although he did possess a nature truly human, still, in this nature he was exalted above the angels. *Ἠλάττωσας αὐτὸν βραχύ τι παρ' ἀγγέλους*, then, simply designates the *condition of man*, as being in itself but little inferior to that of the angels. Man is made in the image of God, Gen. 1: 26, 27. 9: 6. It is plainly the *dignity* of man which the Psalmist intends to describe, when he

says, וַתְּחַסְּרֵהוּ מְּעַט מֵאֱלֹהִים. To such a view of his design, the context of this passage, in Ps. VIII., leads us. The Psalmist looks abroad, and surveys the heavens in all their splendour and glory, and then, with deep sensations of his own comparative insignificance, he exclaims, "What is man that thou shouldest be mindful of him! Or the son of man, that thou shouldest regard him! Yet [וְ *but, yet*] *thou hast made him but little inferior* (וַתְּחַסְּרֵהוּ מְּעַט) to the angels, thou hast crowned him etc." The nature of the case, and the nature of poetic parallelism, here require such an interpretation of the passage in the original Psalm.

But the very same interpretation of it is altogether apposite to the purpose of the writer, in Heb. 2: 1. What is his design? To prove that Christ, in his human nature, is exalted above the angels. How does he undertake to prove this? First, by shewing that this nature itself is made but little inferior to that of the angels, ἠλάττωσας αὐτὸν βραχύ τι παρ' ἀγγέλους; and next, that it has been exalted to the empire of the world, "Thou hast crowned him with glory and honour, and set him over the work of thy hands."

But suppose, now, that we should render βραχύ τι, *for a little while;* what object, which the writer designs to accomplish, is accomplished by such an assertion? It would not contain any proof of the *dignity* of Christ in his human nature, but merely of *temporary inferiority*, i. e. inferiority during the time of his incarnation. Clearly it is not the present object of the writer to prove this. Much more to the purpose does he appear to reason, when we understand him as using βραχύ τι, in the same sense as מְּעַט is used by the Psalmist. The passage thus understood, renders the vindications (attempted by many) of the *liberties*, which the writer is alleged to have taken with Ps. 8: 6, quite unnecessary.

Παρ' ἀγγέλους, in the Hebrew, מֵאֱלֹהִים. On the subject of rendering אֱלֹהִים, ἄγγελοι, see on 1: 6. If we insist that the *usual* meaning of the Hebrew word *Elohim* should be retained, the argument would be still stronger, to prove the dignity of the Messiah in his human nature. *Thou hast made him but little inferior to Elohim*, would represent him, at least, as ἰσάγγελος, if not above the angels. See Gen. 1: 26, 27, from which the language here, and in the sequel, appears to be borrowed.

But how could the apostle use παρ' ἀγγέλους, as conveying the sense of מֵאֱלֹהִים? In answer to this, we may say, (1) It conveys

no meaning that is untrue. If man is but little below Elohim, surely he is not much inferior to the angels. (2) As angels are here compared by the writer with man, or rather, the angelic with the human nature in the person of the Saviour, the passage, as it stands in the Septuagint and as the apostle has quoted it, is apposite to his purpose; although it claims, in fact, *less* for the argument, than would be claimed, by insisting that the word אֱלֹהִים should be interpreted as usual. As the writer was addressing those who used the Septuagint version of the Scriptures, nothing could be more natural than to quote that version as it stood, unless it conveyed an idea that was essentially erroneous. This is just what we do, every day, with our English version of the Scriptures, without suspecting that we are violating any rule of propriety.

Besides the Seventy, the Chaldee has rendered מֵאֱלֹהִים by מִמַּלְאָכַיָּא, i. e. *παρ' ἀγγέλους*. With this rendering Aben Ezra agrees; as do Mendelsohn, Michaelis, Dathe, and others. But, as the writer seems to refer, in Ps. 8: 6—9, to Gen. 1: 26—28, the probability that אֱלֹהִים in Ps. 8: 6 means, *God*, i. e. that the author of the Psalm originally meant to convey this idea when he used it, is pretty strong. Still the apostle, by using the version of the Seventy, *παρ' ἀγγέλους*, has, as I have already said, assumed less in the argument, than the original would have given him; and, at the same time, he has taken a version, which in its present shape is exactly apposite to his purpose, i. e. to shew, that if a comparison of Christ with the angels be made, it will be seen, that during his humiliation he was but little inferior to them, while in his exaltation in the human nature, he is far above them.

Δόξῃ καὶ τιμῇ ἐστεφάνωσας αὐτόν, thou hast crowned him with glory and honour, or, *with exalted honour*. *Δόξῃ καὶ τιμῇ* are nearly equivalent or synonymous; and two synonymous nouns, thus constructed, are expressive of intensity, agreeably to the well known usage of the Hebrew language, from which this idiom is borrowed. In the original, וְכָבוֹד וְהָדָר תְּעַטְּרֵהוּ, which is very literally rendered in the Greek.

But what is the *exalted honour* conferred upon the human nature of Jesus? *Καὶ κατέστησας αὐτὸν ἐπὶ τὰ ἔργα τῶν χειρῶν σου, thou hast set him over the works of thy hands*, i. e. thou hast given him dominion over the creation. *Ἔργα τῶν χειρῶν σου* means simply, *the works which thou hast made*, i. e. thy works. The form

of expression is borrowed from the mode of human operations, in which *hands* are the most conspicuous instrument. *Καθίστημι, sisto, colloco, statuo.* It should be noted, however, that this clause is omitted in some Codices of good authority; such as B. D. and several others.

8. *Πάντα ὑπέταξας ὑποκάτω τῶν ποδῶν αὐτοῦ, thou hast subjected all things to him*, i. e. given him universal dominion. The phrase, *to put under one's feet*, denotes, to put in a state of complete, entire subjection. See Excursus IX.

The writer proceeds to comment on the quotation just made. *Ἐν γὰρ τῷ ὑποτάξαι αὐτῷ τὰ πάντα, οὐδὲν ἀφῆκεν αὐτῷ ἀνυπότακτον*, i. e. the expression is one of universality, it makes no exception, but only God himself; comp. 1 Cor. 15: 27.

Νῦν δὲ οὔπω ὁρῶμεν αὐτῷ τὰ πάντα ὑποτεταγμένα, at present, indeed, we do not see all things yet subjected to him. Ὑποτεταγμένα, subject to his ordering, arrangement, or *disposal.* In other words, 'This prophecy of the Psalmist is not, as yet, wholly fulfilled; but so much of it has been accomplished, that we may regard it as a pledge, that a fulfilment of the rest will certainly follow.' So the sequel.

9. *Τὸν δὲ βραχύ τι γεύσηται θανάτου, but we see Jesus, who was made but little inferior to the angels, crowned with glory and honour on account of the suffering of death, after that he had, by the grace of God, tasted of death for all*, i. e. for Jew and Gentile. So I understand this much controverted and somewhat difficult passage. Two objections against the superiority of Christ over angels, were very naturally urged by the unbelieving Jews upon the believing ones. (1) Christ was a man. (2) He suffered an ignominious death. To the first, the apostle replied in the quotation which precedes, and on which he is commenting. But in doing this, he also suggests the consideration, that the death of Jesus, so far from proving his condition to be inferior to that of the angels, was immediately connected with his exaltation to glory, and with the salvation of the world.

It would be tedious to recount all the various interpretations which have been given to particular parts of the 9th verse. I limit myself merely to stating the reasons of the interpretation which I have given.

Δόξῃ καὶ τιμῇ ἐστεφανωμένον, crowned with the highest honour,

διὰ τὸ πάθημα τοῦ θανάτου, on account of his suffering death. See the same sentiment in Phil. 2: 8—11. Heb. 12: 2. Comp. John 17: 4, 5. Heb. 5: 7—9. Eph. 1: 20—23. Rev. 3: 21.

Ὅπως, the great mass of commentators have translated, *ut, eum in finem ut, unde sequitur ut*, etc. But how was Christ crowned with glory and honour, that he might taste death? To avoid this difficulty, most of them transpose the clause *ὅπως χάριτι κ. τ. λ.* so as to connect it with the first clause of the verse, and translate thus, *Jesus, made for a little time lower than the angels, in order that* [ut, ut sic] *he might taste of death* etc. But the apostle's object here, is not to shew simply that Jesus possessed a nature in which he might taste of death; but that the suffering of death in it, (a fact conceded by all), is no reason why he should be deemed inferior to the angels. Consequently the turn given to the passage, by the above transposition and explanation, is inapposite to the purpose of the writer.

That *ὅπως* generally means, *that, so that, in order that*, etc.; particularly that it has this meaning, in most instances where it occurs in the New Testament; there can be no reasonable doubt. But *ὅπως* also means, *cum, quando, postquam, when, after, after that.* So it means, plainly, in Acts 3: 19, although Wahl has overlooked the passage. So also in Herod. 1: 17. Aristoph. Nub. 61. Soph. Oedip. Col. 1638. Homer. Il. XII. 208. Odys. III. 373. XXII. 22. Eurip. Phoenis. 1155. 1464. This sense also Hoogeveen, Zeunius, Ernesti, Schleusner, and Schneider; assign to it. *Ὅπως* is construed more usually, with the future indicative, or with the subjunctive 1st or 2d aorist, in case these tenses are found in any verb. In the instance before us, it is followed by *γεύσηται*, in the subjunctive aorist 1 middle voice. It may then be rendered by the *past* time, (as I have translated it); just as in the cases where the formula *ὅπως πληρωθῇ* occurs, it is often rendered, or should be rendered, *so that there was an accomplishment.* The only difference in the latter case is, that the voice is passive; which however does not affect the question about the mode of rendering the *tense.*

This method of interpreting the verse frees us from the very great embarrassments, which are presented by most of the others; and the sentiment becomes plain and apposite. 'Jesus did indeed take on him our nature, and suffer in it; but his sufferings were

means of advancing him to supreme dignity, after he had by them procured salvation for the human race, *ὑπὲρ παντός*. So long, then, as the highest glory was consequent upon the sufferings of Jesus, and the salvation of Jew and Gentile was accomplished by it, surely the death of Christ can never prove that he is inferior to the angels.' In this way, all the reasoning of the writer seems to be apposite to his purpose.

Χάριτι θεοῦ means, *by the goodness, kindness, mercy of God.* *Ὑπὲρ παντός* means, *all men without distinction*, i. e. both Jew and Gentile. The same view is often given of the death of Christ. See John 3: 14—17. 4: 42. 12: 32. 1 John 2: 2. 4: 14. 1 Tim. 2: 3, 4. Tit. 2: 11. 2 Pet. 3: 7. Comp. Rom. 3: 29, 30. 10: 11—13. In all these and the like cases, the words *all*, and *all men*, evidently mean, Jew and Gentile. They are opposed to the Jewish idea, that the Messiah was connected appropriately and exclusively with the Jews, and that the blessings of his kingdom were appropriately if not exclusively theirs. The sacred writers mean to declare, by such expressions, that Christ died really and truly as well, and as much, for the Gentiles as for the Jews; that there is no difference at all in regard to the privileges of any one who may belong to his kingdom; and that all men, without exception, have equal and free access to it. But the considerate interpreter, who understands the nature of this idiom, will never think of seeking, in expressions of this kind, proof of the final salvation of *every individual* of the human race. Nor do they, when strictly scanned by the *usus loquendi* of the New Testament, decide directly against the views of those who advocate what is called a *particular redemption*. The question, in all these phrases, evidently respects the *offer* of salvation, the opportunity to acquire it through a Redeemer; not the actual application of promises, the fulfilment of which is connected only with repentance and faith. But whether such an offer can be made with sincerity to those who are reprobates, (and whom the Saviour knows are and will be such), consistently with the grounds which the advocates for particular redemption maintain, is a question for the theologian rather than the commentator to discuss.

Γεύσηται θανάτου, taste of death, i. e. *experience death, suffer it.* So the Hebrew writers use the word טָעַם for *experience;* and classic Greek authors, the word *γεύομαι* in the same sense. E. g.

Ps. 34: 9. Sibyll. Orac. I. p. 164, *Ἅβαμ γευσάμενος θανάτου.* Eunapius de Porphyrio, "*Porphyry* praised the spell of purity, *καὶ διὰ πείρας γευσάμενος, and first tried* [tasted] *it himself.*" Philo (de vita Mosis p. 632), *ἡ διάνοια τῶν γευσαμένων ὁσιότητος, the mind of those who have experienced* [tasted] *holiness.*

10. *Ἔπρεπε γὰρ αὐτῷ δι' ὃν τὰ πάντα καὶ δι' οὗ τὰ πάντα, it became him, for whom all things* [were made], *and by whom all things* [were made]; i. e. it became the supreme Lord and Creator of all things. The writer leaves his readers to feel and acknowledge the truth of this assertion, without stopping to offer proof of its correctness. The force of the appeal seems to lie, in the tacit acknowledgment of all, that reward is properly consequent upon trial and approbation, and is not to be bestowed without them. Now as Christ possessed a nature truly human, and as all men are, by the universal arrangement of a wise and overruling providence, subjected to trial; so it was proper or becoming in God, that Jesus should be subjected to trial in our nature, before he was advanced to glory in it.

Πολλοὺς υἱοὺς ἀγαγόντα κ. τ. λ. This part of the verse contains an involved construction of the words, in respect to their order. The arrangement of the sense I take to be as follows; *Ἔπρεπε γὰρ αὐτῷ διὰ παθημάτων τελειῶσαι τὸν ἀρχηγὸν τῆς σωτηρίας αὐτῶν, ἀγαγόντα πολλοὺς υἱοὺς εἰς δόξαν. It became him τελειῶσαι τὸν ἀρχηγόν.* The word *τέλειος* means, *full grown, of mature age*, either literally, or figuratively. In the latter sense it is employed, in 1 Cor. 2: 6, *however, we speak the doctrines of wisdom ἐν τοῖς τελείοις.* So Heb. 5: 14, comprehending as it were both the above senses, where it is opposed to *νήπιος.* See also 1 Cor. 14: 20. Eph. 4: 3, et alibi. *Τέλειος* also means, *mature* in a moral sense, i. e. *integer, just, free from vices, perfect.* It is also, very naturally, used in a secondary sense, to denote a *consummation* or *maturity* of our nature and happiness in a better world; e. g. 1 Cor. 13: 10. Hence the verb *τελειόω*, formed from the adjective *τέλειος*, is often used to designate, *exaltation to a state of reward or happiness in a future world.* Among the Greeks, this verb was employed to designate the condition of those, who, having run in the stadium and proved to be victorious in the contest, were proclaimed as successful *ἀγωνισταί*, and had the honours, and rewards of victory bestowed upon them. (So *τέλος* is used by the

Greeks, for *reward*, i. e. *consummation*; see Schleusner on τελειόω). Such persons were τετελειωμένοι. In a sense like this is τελειόω usually employed, with reference to Jesus, throughout the epistle to the Hebrews. E. g. 5: 9, τελειωθείς, *being advanced to a state of glory*; 7: 28, τετελειωμένον, id.. The same sense the word has, in the verse under examination. In v. 9, the writer had said, that, *on account of the suffering of death, Jesus was* δόξῃ καὶ τιμῇ ἐστεφανωμένον. Here he says, διὰ παθημάτων τελειῶσαι, *on account of sufferings to exalt to glory*, or, *to bestow the highest honours*. As the writer evidently says this, in commenting on the preceding expression, it is plain that διὰ παθημάτων τελειῶσαι is merely an equivalent for διὰ τὸ πάθημα τοῦ θανάτου δόξῃ καὶ τιμῇ ἐστεφανωμένον. So Theophylact; "τελείωσις here means, δόξαν ἣν ἐδοξάσθη."

Τὸν ἀρχηγὸν σωτηρίας αὐτῶν, *auctor salutis, the author of salvation*; so it is usually interpreted. So Chrysostom, αἴτιος, ὁ τὴν σωτηρίαν τεκών. Probably the phrase, ἀρχηγὸν σωτηρίας αὐτῶν, may mean here, the same as ἀρχηγὸν καὶ σωτῆρα in Acts 5: 31, i. e. *their prince and Saviour*. In Acts 3: 15, ἀρχηγὸν τῆς ζωῆς is applied to Jesus; and in Heb. 12: 2, ἀρχηγὸν τῆς πίστεως; which would rather favour the first interpretation. The sense, however, seems to be substantially expressed, if we render, *on account of sufferings, to exalt to a state of glory their Prince and Saviour*. Thus understood, the passage contains admirable matter of exhortation to the Hebrew Christians, to persevere in their adherence to Christianity, amid all their trials and sufferings; for Jesus their Prince and Saviour himself suffered, and was exalted to glory by his sufferings. If Jesus himself, then, exalted as he was, endured suffering, how could they expect to be exempt from it? Yet, if they persevered in their adherence to him, like him they would be τετελειωμένοι.

11. Ὅτε γὰρ ἁγιάζων καὶ οἱ ἁγιαζόμενοι ἐξ ἑνὸς πάντες. The word ἁγιάζω seems not to have been well understood here, by most commentators, and requires, in order to explain the sense in which it is used in our epistle, a particular investigation. Ἁγιάζω corresponds to the Hebrew קִדֵּשׁ הִקְדִּישׁ, which often means, *to consecrate to God as an offering*; e. g. Lev. 22: 2, לִי יְקַדְּשׁוּ, Sept. ἁγιάζουσί μοι; 22: 3, יַקְדִּישׁוּ, Sept. ἁγιάζωσι; Ex. 13: 2, קַדֶּשׁ לִי, Sept. ἁγίασόν μοι, et alibi. The verb קִדֵּשׁ also means,

by a natural association of ideas, *to expiate, to make atonement for*; e. g. Job. 1: 5, וַיְקַדֵּשֵׁם, *he made atonement for them*, where however the Sept. has ἐκαθάριζεν αὐτούς; so Ex. 19: 10, 14 and Josh. 7: 13, according to Gesenius, where the Sept. has ἅγνισον, ἡγίασε, and ἁγίασον. Comp. also Ezek. 44: 19. The verb ἁγιάζω also corresponds, in the Septuagint, to the Hebrew כִּפֶּר, which is the appropriate word to designate *the making of an atonement, to expiate*; e. g. Ex. 29: 33, *they shall eat those things* אֲשֶׁר כֻּפַּר בָּם, *with which expiation was made*, Sept. ἐν οἷς ἡγιάσθησαν ἐν αὐτοῖς; Ex. 29: 36, *and thou shalt purify the altar*, וְכִפַּרְתָּ עָלָיו, *when thou makest an expiatory sacrifice upon it*, Sept. ἐν τῷ ἁγιάζειν σε ἐπ' αὐτῷ. From the *usus loquendi* of the Hebrew and the Sept. it is plain, then, that ἁγιάζω may mean, *to make expiation, to atone*.

Our epistle presents some plain instances of the use of ἁγιάζω in this sense. E. g. 10: 10, *according to which will* ἡγιασμένοι ἐσμεν, *we are atoned for*, i. e. expiation is made for us. How? The writer immediately subjoins, διὰ τῆς προσφορᾶς τοῦ σώματος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐφάπαξ; which necessarily refers ἡγιασμένοι to the *propitiatory offering* of Christ; and consequently it has the sense which I have given to it. So 13: 11, 12, "For the bodies of those animals, whose blood was carried into the sanctuary by the high priest, as a sin offering, were burned without the camp; wherefore Jesus, ἵνα ἁγιάσῃ the people with his own blood, suffered without the gate;" where ἁγιάσῃ plainly means, *to make expiation for, to atone for*. Both of these passages compare well with that under consideration; and all three predicate ἁγιασμός of the sufferings and death of Christ; for in our context, in the very next preceding clause, the writer has spoken of Christ as τετελειωμένον διὰ παθημάτων; and he had just declared, that "Jesus by the grace of God, *had tasted of death for all men*."

We may then render ὅ,τε ἁγιάζων καὶ οἱ ἁγιαζόμενοι, *both he who makes expiation for sin, and they for whom expiation is made*, אֲשֶׁר כֻּפַּר לָהֶם. The *usus loquendi* of the epistle seems not merely to justify, but to demand, this interpretation.

Ἐξ ἑνὸς πάντες, i. e. have God for their common father. So most commentators. Some say, 'Have Adam for their father;' others, 'Abraham.' The context leads me to doubt whether any of these interpretations is correct. V. 14 et seq. very plainly refers to a community of nature, and states the grounds or reason

why such a community existed. Ἐξ ἑνός then means, that Christ, and those for whom he atoned by his sufferings, were ἐξ ἑνὸς γενοῦς, i. e. possessed in common of the same nature, see v. 14. The reasoning of the writer, when the words are thus understood, is altogether apposite. It seems to be this; 'That Christ had a nature truly human, is no objection to regarding him as a Saviour exalted above the angels, and altogether adapted to the wants and woes of the human race. In the human nature he suffered, and was advanced to glory; in it he made atonement for men; in it he sustains a most endearing relation to those for whom he made expiation, he sympathizes with them, vs. 17, 18, and they are united to him as brethren having one common nature, ἐξ ἑνὸς πάντες κ. τ. λ. vs. 11—13.

Δι' ἣν αἰτίαν καλεῖν, *on account of which*, i. e. because he possesses the same nature in common with them, *he disdains not to call them his brethren.* Οὐκ ἐπαισχύνεται, Chrysostom says, is used with regard to a person of higher rank, who condescends to associate with those of a lower standing. But if Christ were *merely* a man, and nothing more, where (we may ask with Abresch) would be either the great condescension, or particular kindness, manifested in calling men his brethren? If, however, he possessed a higher nature, if ἐκένωσε ἑαυτὸν, μορφὴν δούλου λαβών, Phil. 2: 7; if ἐταπείνωσε ἑαυτόν, Phil. 2: 8; then was it an act of peculiar kindness and condescension in him, to call men his *brethren.* It is this high privilege, to which men have attained, that the apostle is endeavouring to establish and illustrate; and all this affords additional reason not to think diminutively of Jesus, as possessing a human nature.

Having introduced the proposition, that 'Christ, possessing a nature truly human, regards men as his brethren;' the writer appeals, as is usual with him, to the Old Testament, in confirmation of this sentiment, and to shew the Hebrews, that it is no new doctrine respecting the Messiah which he inculcates.

12. Λέγων, *saying*, i. e. since he (Christ) says; ἀπαγγελῶ κ. τ. λ. The passage is quoted from Ps. 22: 23 [21: 22], where, for the Hebrew אֲסַפְּרָה, the Seventy have διηγήσομαι; instead of which, our text employs its equivalent or synonyme, ἀπαγγελῶ. Such departures from the Septuagint are very common, in the New Testament quotations.

That the 22d Psalm relates to the Messiah, the Jews themselves confess, (see Dindorf in loc.); and the history of his death seems, indeed, to be a kind of practical commentary upon it. I can find nothing in the Psalm which forbids the application of it to the Messiah; although I can find enough to satisfy me, that it is quite inapplicable to David. The general conversion of the nations to God, (vs. 28—32), accords well with the gospel dispensation, but not with the Jewish; which from its very nature could not be a *universal* religion; for how could all nations, from the extremities of the earth, ever go up three times in a year to Jerusalem, to worship and to offer sacrifice there? And can it be rationally supposed, that David uttered such words as those to which I have just adverted, in reference merely to Judaism?

The whole object of the present quotation is merely to shew, that Christ is exhibited in the Jewish Scriptures, as having recognized men as his brethren, ἀδελφούς.

Ἐν μέσῳ ἐκκλησίας ὑμνήσω σε, among the assembly will I praise thee, i. e. in or among the assembly of my brethren, of men, will I celebrate thy praise. In the Hebrew, the word לְאַחַי and בְּתוֹךְ קָהָל correspond to each other, and are equivalent, as to the subjects comprised in them. The first part only of the apostle's quotation, is directly to the point which he is labouring to illustrate and confirm; the second part, (as in many like cases), is cited principally because of the intimate connexion which exists between it and the preceding parallelism, and because the memory of those whom he addressed would be assisted, by a quotation at large of the whole verse.

13. *Καὶ πάλιν, again the Scripture says; ἐγὼ ἔσομαι πεποιθὼς ἐπ' αὐτῷ, I confide in him*, or, *I will confide in him*. But whence is this quoted? In Ps. 18: 3, the Hebrew has אֶחֱסֶה בּוֹ, which the Seventy render, *ἐλπιῶ αὐτῷ*; in 2 Sam. 22: 3, the same Hebrew words occur, which they render according to the phraseology of our text, *πεποιθὼς ἔσομαι ἐπ' αὐτῷ*. Some critics have defended the opinion, that the quotation of the apostle is from one of these passages. But as it is plain, not only that the Messiah is not described or alluded to in these passages, but also that the Jews have never been accustomed to interpret them as referring to him; so there is surely no need of defending this position, if another passage as apposite as these can be found, which is less exceptionable

in regard to its application. Critics are pretty generally agreed, therefore, that Is. 8: 17 is quoted, the Hebrew of which is וְקִוֵּיתִי לוֹ, the Septuagint version of which is the same as our quotation. This, considered in connexion with the quotation immediately following, (which is taken from Is. 8: 18), renders it altogether probable, that the writer had this place of Scripture rather than either of the others in his mind, when he made the two quotations in question. The Hebrew, וְקִוֵּיתִי לוֹ, may be rendered, *I will wait for him*, or, *I will trust in him*. The latter is adopted by the Septuagint, and by the apostle.

Καὶ πάλιν ἰδοὺ κ. τ. λ. has been adduced as an argument that the passage quoted here must be from a different part of Scripture and not from the same with that of the quotation immediately preceding. But this does not follow; for in this same epistle, 10: 30, a quotation is made from Deut. 32: 35, and another from Deut. 32: 36, with *καὶ πάλιν* between them as here. In such a case, *καὶ πάλιν* is to be rendered, *and further*, or, *and moreover*.

The argument in this case appears to be this. 'Men exercise trust or confidence in God. This is predicated of them as dependent, and possessing a feeble nature. The same thing is predicated of the Messiah; and consequently he possesses a nature like theirs, and therefore they are his brethren; *ἐξ ἑνὸς πάντες*.' See Excursus X.

14. *Κεκοινώνηκε σαρκὸς καὶ αἵματος, participated in flesh and blood*, i. e. possessed a nature human, a body made up of flesh and blood. See 1 Cor. 15: 50. Eph. 6: 12. and comp. Matt. 16: 17. Gal. 1: 16. Sirach. 14: 18. *The children*, *παιδία*, here mentioned, are the same that are described in the preceding verse, viz. the disciples, the spiritual children of the Messiah.

Καὶ αὐτὸς παραπλησίως μετέσχε τῶν αὐτῶν. Here *μετέσχε* is a synonyme of *κεκοινώνηκε*, *participated in*. *Παραπλησίως* is equivalent to *ὁμοίως, in the same manner as, as well as*. The Docetae exchanged *παραπλησίως* here for *ὁμοίως*, and then construed *ὁμοίως* as indicating only an *appearance* similar to flesh and blood; in opposition to whom the Christian fathers maintained, that *παραπλησίως* signified, *οὐ δοκητῶς ἀλλ' ἀληθινῶς, οὐ φανταστικῶς ἀλλ' ὄντως*.

Τῶν αὐτῶν, i. e. *σαρκὸς καὶ αἵματος*. The meaning is, that Christ had a natural body, truly corporeal and mortal. With this

he was endowed, in order that he might suffer death in it, and by that death vanquish the spiritual enemy of mankind, the great adversary of souls.

"*Ἵνα διὰ θανάτου τὸν διάβολον, that by his death he might subdue him who has a deadly power, that is, the devil.* *Καταργέω* is scarcely used by Greek writers, and when it is employed, it has the sense of *delaying, rendering inactive, hindering*, i. q. *ἐμποδίζειν*, which is used to explain it, by the Scholiast on Eurip. Phoeniss. 760. In this sense, it is often used in the Apocrypha. In the New Testament, the use of the word is not unfrequent; but with some latitude of signification, as may be seen by the lexicons. Here it means, *to render inefficacious*, or, *to subdue*, viz. Satan the spiritual enemy of man, who has *a deadly power*; comp. 1 Cor. 15: 24—26. 2 Tim. 1: 10. I understand *τὸν τὸ κράτος τοῦ θανάτου ἔχοντα*, in this plain and simple manner; which renders all the speculations, about the power of the devil to inflict the sentence of *natural death* upon men, unnecessary; and equally so, all the efforts to show what the Rabbins have taught about Sammael, the angel of death, מַלְאַךְ הַמָּוֶת. That a deadly power, i. e. a power of leading men to sin, and consequently of bringing them under sentence of spiritual death, is ascribed to Satan in the New Testament is sufficiently plain; see John 16: 11. 12: 31. 14: 30. Eph. 2: 2. 6: 12. Col. 2: 15. 2 Cor. 4: 4. et alibi. In 1 John 3: 8, is a passage altogether of the same tenour as ours. *To render null the deadly power of Satan*, is to prevent the effects of it as bringing men to incur the sentence of spiritual death, i. e. to redeem them from the effects of such a sentence, or to redeem them from the curse of the law, Gal. 3: 13; comp. Rom. 5: 9 seq. 1 Thess. 1: 10. Even the temporal consequences of death are removed by Christ, 1 Cor. 15: 21, 26, 45, 52 seq. Thus interpreted, we have a plain sense of the passage, and one analogous to numerous other parts of the Scriptures.

15. *Καὶ ἀπαλλάξῃ τουτοὺς δουλείας, and free those* [from condemnation], *who, during their whole lives, through fear of condemnation, had been exposed to a state of bondage.* "*Απαλλάξῃ* means primarily, *to remove, to depel, to depart.* But here, (as sometimes in classic authors), it means, *to free, to liberate.* So Theophylact, *ἐλευθεροῦσαι.* It may be questionable, whether it is connected with *θάνατος* understood, or with *δουλεία.* Either way of

construing it would make good sense, and be apposite to the design of the writer. I have preferred to connect it with *θάνατος*, because of the sentiment in the preceding verse, which respects the *θάνατον* inflicted by Satan, i. e. the condemning sentence of the law incurred in consequence of sin, committed through the wiles or temptation of Satan.

Φόβῳ θανάτου, I understand as referring to the fear of that condemnation or punishment, to which sin exposes men; not to the fear of natural death; an evil from which no precaution can deliver us, and which Christians as well as others must suffer, notwithstanding the death of Christ. But the death of Christ has freed them from suffering that condemnation or punishment which they feared, in a future life. This seems to be the obvious meaning of the writer; although it has been generally overlooked.

Διὰ παντὸς τοῦ ζῆν, i. q. *διὰ πάσης τῆς ζωῆς*, the infinitive mode being here used, as it often is in the Greek classics, as a mere noun. But it is not the usage of the older Greek writers, to put the infinitive *nominascens* after an adjective, as here. We may, therefore, understand *χρόνου* as implied after *παντός*. The later Greek, however, affords examples like ours; e. g. *τὸ ἀδιάφορον ζῆν, τὸ ἀληθινὸν ζῆν, ἐκ τοῦ προκειμένου ζῆν*, Ignat. Ep. ad Trall.

Ἔνοχοι ἦσαν δουλείας, *had been subjected*, [obnoxious, exposed] *to servitude*, i. e. subject to a depressed and miserable condition, like that of slaves under a tyrannical master. *Ἔνοχος* comes from *ἐνέχομαι*, *adstringor*, and so means, *adstrictus*, *alligatus*. It usually governs the dative, as Matt. 5: 21, 22 bis; and thus in classic writers. But it also governs the genitive, as here; e. g. Matt. 26: 66. Mark 3: 29. 14: 64. 1 Cor. 11: 27. James 2: 10. *Δουλείας* means, the servile and depressed condition of those who are exercised with the fear of death, i. e. of future misery. It is the death of Christ which delivers them from the condemnation, the anticipation or fear of which had often, during their lives, depressed them, or made them unhappy. Comp. John 8: 32—35, where, however, the *δουλεία* referred to is the servitude of sin. Here it is the condition, into which the fear of future condemnation casts Christians.

The deliverance spoken of, is accomplished by anticipation here, Rom. 8: 14—17; but fully and finally, in another world.

where the pious are admitted to a state of confirmed happiness. *Διὰ παντὸς τοῦ ζῆν ἔνοχοι ἦσαν δουλείας*, does not necessarily imply, that *the whole time of life* had been actually occupied with a state of fear and depression, *δουλείας*; but that during the whole of it, those who are delivered had been, more or less, *exposed* to agitation by fears of this nature. From the object of such fears Christ delivers, or will deliver them; and this is the simple sentiment of the text.

16. *Οὐ γὰρ δήπου ἀγγέλων ἐπιλαμβάνεται, besides, he did not extend aid at all to the angels*; another reason why he took on him a nature that was human. He came to the aid of *man*; he became like him, so as the more intimately to sympathize with him, and to help him. *Δήπου, profecto, omnimodo, certe*, strengthens the affirmation, i. e. gives intensity to it. *Ἐπιλαμβάνεται*, lit. *to grasp*, or, *to take hold of with the hand*. Hence, figuratively, (1) *To assert one's right* to a thing; *to lay hold of it* as one's own; and (2) *To aid, help, succour, to take hold of* when falling or in danger. In the Septuagint, it answers to the Hebrew תָּמַךְ, אָזַר, סָעַד. The Christian fathers have applied it to the assumption of an angelic nature, which they suppose the writer here denies. But the *usus loquendi* is against this; and the context also. For the apostle had just asserted above, that Jesus took on him a nature *human*; and it would be a mere repetition of the same sentiment here, if we construe v. 16 as meaning thus; 'He did not assume the angelic nature, but that of the seed of Abraham.' But if the argument be, that 'Jesus assumed the human nature, because he was *to aid* men and not angels,' then the 16th verse contains a reason why the Saviour did and should take on him the nature of man; viz. that it was altogether accordant with the great object of his mission.

Σπέρματος Ἀβραάμ, progeny of Abraham. In such a sense, profane as well as sacred writers use *σπέρμα*. Is it the *natural* or *spiritual* seed of Abraham, which is here meant? Either will make good sense, and agree with the object of the writer. *Believers* are the children of Abraham, Gal. 3: 7; and Gentiles as well as Jews, Rom. 4: 12—18. 9: 7, 8. 3: 29, 30. So, the assertion that Christ died *ὑπὲρ παντός* (v. 9), does not disagree with the assertion that he helped the seed of Abraham, who are both Jews and Gentiles. But, although this interpretation may be sufficiently

justified to render it worthy of acceptation, I am inclined to believe, that it does not give the original sense of the writer. He is addressing *Jews*. He says, 'Christ had a human nature; this it behooved him to possess, for he came to help the seed of Abraham, i. e. those who, being descended from Abraham, possessed a nature that was human.' His assertion extends merely to such as he was addressing. But surely this would not imply a denial that he helped any others, who were possessed of the same nature. So far is it from this, that it implies the contrary; for the amount of the assertion is, 'He came to help those, who possessed a nature such as that which he had assumed.'

17. *Ὅθεν*, an illative particle, *whence*, i. e. because he was to help the seed of Abraham. *Ὤφειλε ὁμοιωθῆναι, he must needs be made like unto his brethren*, i. e. to men, vs. 10—12. *Κατὰ πάντα*, i. e. in all things requisite to constitute a nature truly human. The meaning is, that he should be wanting in none of the innocent infirmities, and in none of the sympathies, of man's nature. To deduce more than this from the expression now in question, would be to do what the writer plainly never designed should be done.

But why? *Ἵνα ἐλεήμων γένηται καὶ πιστὸς ἀρχιερεύς, that he might be a compassionate and faithful high priest. Ἐλεήμων, merciful, sympathizing with those who are in distress.* As those are best adapted to do this, who have themselves been sufferers; so Jesus took on him our nature, in order that he might suffer in it. *Πιστός* is either, *faithful*, or, *worthy of trust* or *confidence*. In the former sense I take it here. Jesus assumed our nature, that he might qualify himself in a peculiar manner to exercise compassion toward us; and that he might discharge with fidelity the duty laid upon him as our high-priest. A priest to offer sacrifice for us, must be homogeneous with us. Such a priest was Jesus, faithful in discharging the duties of his office. What were those duties? They were *τὰ πρὸς τὸν Θεόν, things which had respect to God*, i. e. services of a religious nature. The phrase *πιστὸς τὰ πρὸς τὸν Θεόν*, is elliptical. In full, it would be thus; *κατὰ τὰ πράγματα τὰ πρὸς τὸν Θεόν, faithful as to things* etc.

But what things were these? *Ἱλάσκεσθαι τὰς ἁμαρτίας τοῦ λαοῦ*. The common expression is, *ἐξιλάσασθαι περί τινος*; as in Lev. 4: 20, 26, 31, 35; or *ἐξιλάσασθαι περὶ τῆς ἁμαρτίας τινός*,

Lev. 5: 13. 4: 35. But *ἐξιλάσασθαι ἁμαρτίας* also occurs, Dan. 9: 24. 1 Sam. 3: 14. Sirach 28: 5. *Ἱλάσκομαι* means, *to render propitious, to appease.* But this sense it can have directly, only when the *person* appeased is expressed or understood after the verb. Hence *ἱλάσκεσθαι ἁμαρτίας* must mean the same as כִּפֶּר וְחַטָּאת, *to make appeasement for sin, to cover sin, to make atonement for it.* The Septuagint sometimes translate כִּפֶּר by *ἱλάσκομαι.* Christ, then, as high priest, was faithful to perform the peculiar duty of that office; which was, on the great day of atonement, to make a propitiatory sacrifice for the sins of the people. How he did this, is shewn in the sequel of the epistle. Here, only so much is asserted, as was requisite to enforce the considerations which the writer had immediately in view.

18. *Ἐν ᾧ γάρ, for since,* i. q. *ὅτι γάρ,* Hebrew בַּאֲשֶׁר, *because that, inasmuch as. Πέπονθεν αὐτὸς πειρασθείς, he himself suffered when exercised with trials. Πειράζω* means, *to try, to put to the proof,* in order to ascertain the disposition, purpose, capacity, etc. of any one. This trial may be, (1.) For a good purpose; by subjecting one to any evils or dangers, as God tried (נִסָּה) Abraham, Gen. 22: 1; or, by placing him in circumstances either prosperous or adverse, that are of a peculiar nature, as God did Israel, Ex. 16: 4. Judg. 2: 22. Trial may be, (2.) For an evil purpose; as the Pharisees *ἐπείρασαν Ἰησοῦν,* by proposing to him ensnaring and subtile questions, Matt. 19: 3 seq. 22: 18, 35, et saepe; or, by laying before any one inducements to sin, as Satan does before the minds of men, 1 Cor. 7: 5. 1 Thess. 3: 5; comp. James 1: 13, 14. In both of these senses, Christ was tried. "It pleased the Lord to bruise him, and to put him to grief, Is. 53: 10;" and, "It became him, for whom and by whom are all things, to advance to glory our Prince and Saviour, *διὰ παθημάτων,* Heb. 2: 10." The same Saviour was solicited by Satan to sin, Matt. 4: 1, 3. Mark 1: 13. Luke 4: 2. Understood in either way, then, the Saviour was tempted in like manner as we are, (*κατὰ πάντα, καθ' ὁμοιότητα,* Heb. 4: 15), though without sin. That he did not yield to any excitement to sin, was owing to the strength of his virtue and holiness, not to the weakness of the temptation in itself considered. Temptation, in the second sense, is that which is presented to the mind as an inducement to sin, and does not relate to the actual state of the mind or person to which it is presented.

Men tempt God; they tempt Christ; and so did Satan; but there never was any disposition in Christ to yield to it.

There are two or three cases, however, in which the word *πειράζω* seems to denote yielding to sin, i. e. having the effect of *πειρασμός* produced upon one; e. g. Gal. 6: 1, perhaps James 1: 14; comp. *ἀπείραστος, not induced to sin*, in James 1: 13. But this is an *unusual* sense of the word *πειράζω*, and altogether inapplicable to the Saviour, who was "separate from sinners," Heb. 7: 26. Christ then, *πειρασθείς, being proved*, both by sufferings and by solicitations to sin, *δύναται τοῖς πειραζομένοις βοηθῆσαι*, is fitted in a peculiar manner to succour those, who undergo either kind of trial. He is not only possessed of a merciful regard for them (v. 17), but he has direct and immediate sympathy with them, the result of his own personal feeling and experience. Wonderful condescension of redeeming love! Here lies the great mystery of godliness, God made manifest in the flesh. And while Jesus sits on the throne of the universe, Lord over all, the Christian is reminded, that he does this in his nature, as his *brother*, v. 11. In the person of Jesus, man is exalted above the angels; yea, he himself is to attain a rank superior to theirs; for while Jesus passed them by (v. 16), he laid down his life for us, in order to exalt us above them, 1 Cor. 6: 3. Deeper and deeper still becomes the mystery. The debt of gratitude appears boundless, when viewed in this light; the baseness of our ingratitude and disobedience as boundless too; and all that we can do is to lie down in the dust, overwhelmed with a sense of them, exclaiming at the same time with the prophet, "Who is like unto thee? A God forgiving iniquity, and passing by the offences of thine heritage!"

Next to the consideration, that the "law was *διαταγεὶς δι' ἀγγέλων*," the grounds of its preeminence in the estimation of the Jews were, the exalted character of Moses, and the dignity and offices of the high priest, who was the instrument of reconciling the people to God, when they had lost his favour by sinning. In respect to both these points, the apostle undertakes to shew that the gospel has a preference, because that Jesus is superior. If he be compared with Moses as פָּקִיד, *ἀπόστολος, curator aedis sacrae*, (οἴκου, v. 2, 3), he will be found to excel him. If he be compared with the high priest, his superiority, in every respect, is equally visible. The first comparison is made in 3: 2—6, and the warning against defection from the gospel that immediately follows it, is continued through 3: 7—19 to 4: 13. The writer then proceeds with the comparison of Christ as high priest, and extends it through the remainder of the doctrinal part of the epistle.

CHAP. III.

Ὅθεν, *whence*, i. q. *διὰ τοῦτο*, by which Chrysostom expresses the sense of it. It refers to *place*, in common usage; but it is also *illative*, particularly in our epistle.

The manner in which the writer makes his transition here, from one topic to another, is deserving of notice. He had just been shewing how and why Christ was a "merciful and faithful high priest, and able to succour all who are tempted." He now adds, *ὅθεν*, i. e. allowing these things to be true, it follows, that we are under peculiar obligation to contemplate and well examine the Saviour's character, before we venture to reject him. But in making this suggestion, the writer at the same moment introduces new topics for discussion, viz. the comparison of Christ with Moses, and with the high priest under the Jewish dispensation. The transition is almost insensible, as it is actually introduced under the form of a deduction from the preceding discussion.

Ἀδελφοί, as applied by Christians to each other, means, *one of the same faith* or *profession*, with the adjunct idea of *possessing a friendly, brotherly feeling*, Acts 9: 30. 11: 29. 1 Cor. 5: 11. al. *Ἅγιοι*, *consecrated, devoted*, i. e. to Christ, *set apart* as Christians. So I understand this appellation. *Holy*, in the sense of possessing internal purity, the apostle did not mean to affirm that all were, whom he addressed; for surely when the ancient prophets called the whole Jewish nation קְדֹשִׁים (*ἅγιοι*), or עַם קָדוֹשׁ (*λαὸς ἅγιος*), they did not mean to assert that every individual among them was *spiritually* sanctified. But to remind his brethren, (brethren in a double sense here, as they were also the writers kindred according to the flesh), that they had been *consecrated* to Christ, and *set apart* as his disciples, was altogether adapted to prepare them for the exhortation to fidelity which ensues. In a like sense, the ancient prophets called the whole body of the Jewish nation *holy*, קָדוֹשׁ.

Κλήσεως ἐπουρανίου μέτοχοι, lit. *partakers of the heavenly invitation*. *Κλῆσις* is the invitation given on the part of God and Christ to men, to come and partake of the blessings proffered by the Christian religion. It does not appear, however, to designate the offers of the gospel, generally considered, and in reference to all men without discrimination; for it is applied, in the New Tes-

tament, only to those who by profession are Christians. *Κλῆσις*, then, is the *proffer* of blessings to such; the *invitation* given to all the professed friends of the Christian religion, to accept the favours which the Redeemer is ready to bestow, in case of their obedience. The epithet *ἐπουρανίου* may mean, in this case, that the blessings proffered are of a *celestial nature*. So Wahl and others, who compare the phrase with *τῆς ἄνω κλήσεως*, Phil. 3: 14. Thus interpreted, the implication of the passage would be, that the proffered blessings of the gospel were *ἐπουράνια*, in distinction from those offered under the law, i. e. they are of a higher, more spiritual, more sublime nature. But *ἐπουρανίου* may also mean, that the *κλῆσις* was given from heaven, i. e. by one from heaven, viz. Christ; comp. 12: 25 and 2: 3. Understood in either way, it is apposite to the purpose of the writer, and well adapted to urge upon his readers their obligation to adhere to the Christian religion.

Κατανοήσατε, observe well, consider attentively, perpendite, ad animum revocate; and this, in order that they might not be tempted to swerve from their fidelity to Christ, out of excessive regard to the Mosaic institutes; for Christ, as the writer proceeds to shew, was in all respects superior to Moses.

Τὸν ἀπόστολον ἡμῶν, the apostle and high priest of our religion. The appellation *ἀπόστολον*, (which is an *ἅπαξ λεγόμενον* as applied to Christ), has given rise to much philological and critical discussion. The word itself may convey two ideas, nearly related, but not identical. (1) *Ἀπόστολος* is equivalent to *ὁ ἀπεσταλμένος*; as Thomas Magister explains it, quoting Demosthenes as employing it in this manner. It means, then, *any messenger, any person commissioned or sent to perform duties of any kind for another*, and particularly to make known his will, desire, or command; in which sense it is commonly employed by the New Testament writers. (2) The Jews applied the term שְׁלִיחַ, (from שָׁלַח *mittere*), to the *minister of the synagogue*, i. e. the person who presided over it, and directed all its officers and affairs, the curator of all its concerns, *aedituus, negotii aedis sacrae curator*. See Buxtorf Lex. Chald. verbum שְׁלִיחַ, and Vitringa de Vet. Synag. Lib. III. p. 2. c. 2. In either of these senses it may be understood, in the passage under consideration. Interpreted agreeably to the first sense of *ἀπόστολος*, the meaning would be, that Christ

is the messenger of God to men, in order to communicate his will, and to accomplish the business to be done for the establishment of the new dispensation. But the particular reason why he is called ἀπόστολος here, lies, probably, in the comparison which the writer is about to make, of Jesus the head of the new dispensation with Moses the head of the old. When Moses received a divine commission to become the leader and head of the Israelites, God says to him, שְׁלַחְתִּיךָ, *I have sent thee;* which idea is frequently repeated, Ex. 3: 10, 12, 14, 15. Moses then was שָׁלִיחַ, ἀπόστολος, in respect to this important business. Jesus, in like manner, was sent on an errand of the like kind, but of still greater importance. He was *sent* by the Father for this purpose, John 3: 34. 5: 36, 37. 6: 29. 10: 36 al. Now as the writer was just about to make a comparison between Christ and Moses, it was very natural that he should call Christ ἀπόστολον, i. e. *one sent* or *commissioned of God*, because Moses was thus *sent;* as the passages above cited prove.

We might acquiesce in this explanation, as most interpreters have done, were it not that one still better may be found, in the supposition that ἀπόστολος is here employed in the second or Jewish sense, explained above. The apostle proceeds immediately to speak of Moses and of Christ as presiding over, and administering the affairs of, the οἶκος, committed respectively to them (vs. 2—4); i. e. each was a שָׁלִיחַ הַמְצַוֶּה, ἄγγελος ἐκκλησίας, *curator aedis sacrae*, ἀπόστολος in the *Jewish* sense. This certainly gives a meaning more apposite to the context, and indeed a sense which, in connexion with it, seems to be a necessary one. The general idea of being *sent* of God, or *divinely commissioned*, is retained; inasmuch as Moses was thus sent and commissioned, and with him the comparison is made. The meaning then is, that if the *curator aedis sacrae et novae* be compared with the *curator aedis sacrae et antiquae*, the result will be such as the sequel discloses.

Καὶ ἀρχιερέα, high priest. Two reasons may be given for this appellation; the one, that in Ps. 110: 4, the Messiah is so named; the other, that the writer means to compare him, in the sequel, as making atonement for men by the propitiatory sacrifice which he offered, with the high priest of the Jews who made expiation for the people. The latter, I regard as the principal reason of the appellation here.

Τῆς ὁμολογίας ἡμῶν, of our profession or *confession*; i. e. the apostle and high priest whom we have confessed or acknowledged as ours. This they had done, when they became Christians. *Ὁμολογίας* is used here as an adjective or participle; and the phrase is equivalent to *ἀπόστολον ἡμῶν καὶ ἀρχιερέα ὁμολογούμενον*, i. e. the apostle and high priest *τῆς πίστεως ἡμῶν* (as Chrysostom paraphrases it), in whom we have believed, or whom we have acknowledged as ours. Comp. 2 Cor. 9: 13, *τῇ ὑποταγῇ τῆς ὁμολογίας ὑμῶν, your professed subjection*; Heb. 10: 23. 4: 14.

Others take *ὁμολογίας* in the sense of *covenant*, בְּרִית, which the word sometimes has in profane writers; see Schleus. Lex. in verbum. This sense of the word would not be inapposite here, inasmuch as it would convey the idea of an *engagement* or *covenant* made with Christ, by those whom the apostle is addressing. But as this use of the word is not found in the New Testament, it would hardly be proper to admit it here.

The writer now proceeds to shew the reason why the Hebrews ought attentively to regard Jesus, in respect to the two great points of comparison which he had hinted at, by applying to him the epithets *ἀπόστολος* and *ἀρχιερεύς*.

2. *Πιστόν, faithful*, i. e. he fully and truly performed the duties of his station. See 2: 17, where, in like manner, he is called *πιστὸς ἀρχιερεύς*. Others interpret *πιστός, entrusted with*, or, *worthy of trust*; a sense, indeed, which the word sometimes has; but it is not so apposite here. *Τῷ ποιήσαντι αὐτόν, to him who constituted* or *appointed him*, viz. *ἀπόστολον*; to him who sent him, John 10: 36; to him who made him פְּקִידַת, *curator aedis sacrae*. So *ἐποίησε*, Mark. 3: 14.

Τῷ οἴκῳ αὐτοῦ, his house, i. e. family, meaning the Jewish nation, or, his worshipping people. *Οἶκος* evidently does not mean *temple* here, for that was not built in the time of Moses; nor does it mean *tabernacle*, for over that Aaron presided, and not Moses. It means, then, the *spiritual house* committed to Moses, i. e. the Jewish nation who were to be guided, regulated, and instructed in spiritual things, by the revelations which he gave them. So Chrysostom, who substitutes *λαόν* as an explanation of *οἶκον*. So in English, we use *house* for *family*, and *church* (*οἶκος θεοῦ*) for *the worshippers* in it. It is, moreover, only in this way, that a comparison can be made between Moses and Christ; as the latter was

not the minister of any *literal house*, but *curator aedis Dei sacrae et spiritualis*. Comp. 1 Tim. 3: 15. 1 Pet. 2: 5, οἶκος πνευματικός. Eph. 2: 20—22. Heb. 3: 6.

The sentiment of v. 2 is, that with regard to *fidelity* in discharging the duties of his office, as head of the new dispensation, Christ yields not in any respect to Moses, who, (as the Scripture testifies, Num. 12: 7), was faithful in respect to all his duties toward the people of God, that were committed to his care. In *this* respect there is no inferiority. In *another* respect, however, Christ may justly claim great superiority over Moses; as the writer now goes on to shew.

3. *Δόξης, honour, dignity, regard;* governed in the genitive by ἠξίωται. Ἠξίωται, *is worthy, deserves, is counted worthy.* Ἀξιόω also means, not unfrequently, *to obtain, to acquire;* e. g. οἱ καταξιωθέντες τῆς τοῦ πνεύματος χάριτος, *those who have obtained the grace of the Spirit*, Chrysostom I. p. 730. Τῆς ἐπιγνώσεως τοῦ ὄντος μὴ καταξιούμενος, *not having obtained a knowledge of what is real*, Basil I. p. 515. In a similar way, it is also used in the classics; as τῶν μεγίστων ἀξιούμενος, *having obtained the greatest honours*, Lys. Orat. p. 101. ed. Taylor. But still, this is not the usual sense of the word; nor does it so well fit the passage under consideration, as the other and usual meaning, although many commentators have preferred it. Δόξης παρὰ Μωϋσῆν, *glory in comparison with Moses*, as in Hebrew כָּבוֹד מִמֹּשֶׁה. See on 1: 4, 9, where παρά is employed in the same way.

Καθ' ὅσον may signify, *in proportion as, as much as*, and may have relation, here, to πλείονος in the first member of the verse. The usual Greek method of expression in such cases is, τόσῳ . . . ὅσῳ etc. But I prefer the sense given in the version, because the nature of the proposition seems to require it. So Schulz, Eng. Version, alii.

Πλείονα τιμήν κ. τ. λ. *he who builds a house, has more honour than the house;* i. e. the difference between the honour due to Moses and that due to Christ, is as great as between the honour due to the founder of a house [family] and that which should be paid to the family which he founds; or, between the honour due to the architect that framed a building, and that due to the building itself. It is difficult to say in which of these senses the writer meant that the words should be taken. Either fits his purpose. Either is de-

signed to shew that Christ, at the same time that he is the head of the new spiritual house, is also the founder of it; while Moses, who was at the head of the ancient spiritual house, was himself only one of the household. As a steward or overseer of a house, while he is curator of all in the house, is still but a servant; so Moses, as is asserted in v. 5, was but a servant; while Christ, who was curator, was also *Son*, and therefore "heir and lord of all." The point of comparison between Moses and Christ, in which the latter appears to have a decided preference, is not the being at the head of God's house or family, (for such an office Moses sustained); but it consists in this, viz. that while Moses was *curator*, he was also θεράπων; but while Christ was *curator*, he was at the same time υἱός, and κατασκευάστης οἴκου.

Κατασκευάζω means, *to furnish, to fit up, to make ready*, i. e. for use; also, *to construct, prepare, build, condere, exstruere*. In some cases it seems to combine the idea of *constructing* and *furnishing*, both of which indeed are included under the general idea of *preparing* or *making ready* for use; e. g. Heb. 9: 2—6. The Seventy sometimes used this word, in order to translate עָשָׂה, e. g. in Prov. 23: 5. 2 Chron. 32: 5; sometimes they employed it as corresponding to בָּרָא, as in Is. 40: 28. 43: 7. So the book of Wisdom, 9: 2, "By thy wisdom κατεσκεύασας τὸν ἄνθρωπον, *thou hast created* [formed] man." In our text, κατασκευάσας αὐτόν, scil. οἶκον, is equivalent to the Latin, *condere domum*. But as οἶκος here means, *family, household*, so κατασκευάσας must be taken in a sense that will correspond to this, viz, that of *establishing, instituting, founding*; which is evidently the meaning of the phrase.

Others render the last clause of the verse thus; *inasmuch as he who founded the household hath greater honour from the house*, understanding τιμὴν οἴκου to be the honour which the house renders, and thus making οἴκου dependent on τιμὴν instead of πλείονα. Storr translates the whole verse thus; *For Christ hath a preference above Moses, the greater, in proportion as this house is more highly estimated by its founder*. But these methods of rendering, (to say nothing of the improbable and forced construction which they give to the language of the verse), would constrain us to lose sight of the *apodosis*, which the latter part of the verse evidently contains. Christ, says the apostle, has more glory than Moses. How? or, how much more? The answer is; 'As much more as is due to the

founder of a family, [or, to the architect of a building], above that which is to be paid to the family itself, [or, to the edifice which is reared].' In other words, Christ is to be honoured as the *head* and *founder* of the οἶκος, which has been erected; Moses, only as the *head*; for he himself was still a part of the οἶκος itself, ὡς θεράπων v. 5. Interpreted in any other way, the whole force of the comparison seems to vanish. In this way it is (to say the least) intelligible, if not quite simple. If the reader wishes to see the endless discrepancies among critics about this and the following verse, he may consult Wolfii Curae Philol., or Dindorf's edition of *Ernesti in Ep. ad Hebraeos.*

4. This verse has been a kind of *offendiculum criticorum*, in past ages, and has never yet, in any commentary which I have seen, been satisfactorily illustrated. The difficulty lies, not in the simple sentiment of the verse by itself considered, (for there is none in this respect); nor in the words, which in themselves are not obscure; but in discovering and explaining the connexion in which this verse stands with the context, and how it modifies or affects it. If the verse be entirely omitted, and the third verse be immediately connected with the fifth, there seems to be nothing wanting, nothing omitted that is at all requisite to finish the comparison which the writer is making. Nay, on account of the difficulty which adheres to the 4th verse, the mind is greatly relieved by the omission of it; and little is then presented, which raises doubts or scruples about the object of the writer. There is no evidence, however, that the verse in question is a mere gloss; at least, none from manuscripts or versions that is of any value. We must receive it, then, as a part of the text, the integrity of which, (however difficult the passage may be), cannot be made to depend on our ability to explain it.

Πᾶς γὰρ οἶκος.... θεός, I translate thus; *every house must have some builder*, or, *is built by some one; and he who formed all things is God.* But what are the *all things* (τὰ πάντα) which are *formed* or *built?* The universe? Or all οἶκοι, all *dispensations*, viz. both the Jewish and Christian? The context seems to demand the latter meaning. The former has common usage in its favour. Is it appropriate to construe it agreeably to this usage? It is directly to the writer's purpose, if he can shew, that every dispensation must of necessity have some founder, and that this founder was Christ. But how is this shewn? To say that God, simply consid-

ered, was *the author of all things*, would not be to shew that Christ was the founder of the Jewish and Christian οἴκοι. Indeed, I can see no possible connexion of this proposition, with the object which the writer has in view. Nor can I see how Christ is shewn by him to be a *founder* at all, unless I understand him to assert this to be the fact, because Christ is divine, or is θεός. The argument would then stand thus; 'God is the author of all things, (and, by consequence, of the Jewish and Christian οἴκοι); Christ is God; of course he must be regarded as the original author or founder of these dispensations.' The fact itself that Christ is θεός, the writer surely could not hesitate to assert, after what he has said, chap. 1: 8—12. John 1: 1 asserts the same thing; as Paul also does, in Rom. 9: 5, and in other places. I must regard the expression here, as predicated on what the writer had said in chap. 1., respecting the Son. The amount, then, of the reasoning seems to be; 'Consider that Christ, as θεός and the former of all things, must be the *author* too of the Jewish and Christian dispensations; which shews that a glory belongs to him, not only in his mediatorial office and as being at the head of the new dispensation, but also as the founder both of this and the Jewish dispensation, in his divine character; while Moses is to be honoured only as the head of the Jewish dispensation, in the quality of a commissioned superintendent, but not as author and founder.'

All other methods of constructing this passage fail of making it contribute to the writer's purpose; and this is, with me, an insuperable objection against them. To make θεός, in verse 4th, refer simply to God the Father, is, at least, making the apostle say something very different from what contributes to his purpose, if it be not at variance with it. I propose this exegesis, however, only as being that which, after repeated investigations, I have felt myself constrained to adopt by the reasoning in the context, and the design of the writer; not as one so indubitably clear as to admit of no specious objection. The whole passage is so obscure, that no one can reasonably expect, as yet, a very convincing interpretation of it. If probability can be attained, it is as much as can be fairly demanded, at present.

5. Ἐν ὅλῳ τῷ οἴκῳ αὐτοῦ, *in all his house*; not ἐπὶ τὸν οἶκον αὐτοῦ, *over his house*, as it is expressed in the following verse, where the writer speaks of Christ. I think the writer means here to make

a distinction, by these different modes of expression, between the relation of Moses to the house in which he was *θεράπων*, and that of Christ to the house over which he was as *υἱός*. The former was *ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ, in the house*, i. e. he himself belonged to the family of God, was simply a member of it in the capacity of *θεράπων*; while the latter was *ἐπὶ τὸν οἶκον, over the house*, i. e. lord of the house, founder and proprietor of it.

Αὐτοῦ, HIS, i. e. God's house, both in v. 2 and here. *God's household* means, those who profess to be his worshippers, to belong to him. In both cases, *αὐτοῦ* might refer to Christ, were it not that in Num. 12: 7 (from which the passage is quoted), the language is, *my house*, בֵּיתִי; and it is *God* who says this. The sense, however, would not be materially changed, by referring *αὐτοῦ* to Christ. The scope of the sentence does not depend on this; for whether you say *οἶκος αὐτοῦ* is the family of God, or of Christ, the same persons are designated by the word *οἶκος*, in both cases.

Θεράπων, according to general usage, differs from *δοῦλος* and *οἰκέτης*, being a more honorable appellation. E. g. the correlate of *δοῦλος* and *οἰκέτης* is *δεσπότης*; but *θεράπων* is related to *πατήρ*, *κύριον*, or *βασιλεύς*. In English, we should call the former a *servant* or *a slave*; the latter, *an assistant*, *an usher*, *a helper*, &c. The Heb. עֶבֶד, however, means *servants* of every or any rank. But עֶבֶד יְהוָה, *servant of Jehovah*, is always an appellation of honour. In the East, courtiers of the highest rank pride themselves in the appellation of *king's servants*. The word *θεράπων* is very happily applied by the Seventy, and after them in the present case by our author, to Moses; who was a servant of Jehovah, in a highly honourable sense. Comp. Josh. 1: 1, 2. After all, the *θεράπων* is inferior to the *πατήρ* or *κύριος* of a family. Moses, therefore, was inferior to Christ, who was *κύριος οἴκου θεοῦ*.

Εἰς μαρτύριον τῶν λαληθησομένων, for testimony to those things which were to be declared, i. e. to make disclosures to the Israelites of those things which were to be revealed, under the ancient dispensation, or during the Mosaic period. The meaning is, that Moses was a *θεράπων* of God, for delivering to the people the ancient oracles. *Μαρτύριον* may signify either *instruction*, or *declaration, publication*; just as *μαρτυρέω* signifies in the New Testament, both *docere*, *instituere*, and *declarare*, *notum facere*; as may be seen in the Lexicons. *Λαληθησομένων* may also mean, either *things to be*

announced, published, or, *things to be inculcated, taught*. The sense will not be materially altered by either method of translation. The meaning will still be, simply, that Moses was to be the instrument of delivering to the people divine communications, or, he was to teach them in matters of religion.

6. *Χριστὸς δὲ..... ἐσμεν ἡμεῖς, but Christ as a Son, over his house, whose house we are*, i. e. to whose family we belong, we who have made a Christian profession; meaning himself and those whom he addressed. This is as much as to say, 'We now belong not to the house over which Moses was placed; but to that which Christ governs or administers.' *Αὐτοῦ, his*, i. e. God's, our English translators have rendered as if written *αὑτοῦ*, sc. *ἑαυτοῦ, his own*; so Beza, Vogel, Erasmus, Heinrichs, and others. But Stephens, Mill, Bengel, Wetstein, Griesbach, Knapp, and Titmann read *αὐτοῦ*; as I have translated.

The writer adds, however, that we really belong to the house which Christ governs, *ἐάνπερ τὴν παῤῥησίαν..... κατάσχωμεν, provided we hold fast unto the end our confidence and joyful hope. Παῤῥησία* means originally, *the liberty of speaking boldly*, without fear or restraint; and comes etymologically from *παρά* and *ῥῆσις*. The secondary sense is, *boldness, confidence*. *Καύχημα* primarily means, *gloriatio, the act of glorying*, or, *that in which we glory* or *joy*; secondarily, it means, *joy, glory*, etc. I take the phrase as a Hendiadys. *Ἐλπίδος* is the subject, and *καύχημα* qualifies it; as is often the case with similar constructions, in many parts of the sacred writings; e. g. 1 Tim. 6: 17. Philem. 6. Rom. 6: 4. Col. 2: 5. 2 Cor. 4: 7. Gal. 2: 14; where the genitive, (as in the instance before us), is the *principal* noun, and the other noun joined with it, (whatever case it may be in), serves only in the office of an adjective. More usually, indeed, the noun in the *genitive* serves the office of an adjective, both in Hebrew and in Hebrew Greek. But the above cases shew, that the noun which *precedes* the genitive, not unfrequently serves the same end; and such too is the case in Hebrew, as may be seen in Heb. Gram. § 161. *b*.

The confidence and joyful hope here mentioned, is that which the Christian religion inspires. This must be held *βεβαίαν, firm, steadfast*. *Βεβαίαν* here agrees, in respect to grammatical construction, with *παῤῥησίαν* the remoter noun in the preceding phrase, (as is frequently the fact in such cases), but it is related to the

whole phrase, in regard to its meaning. *Εἰς τέλους, to the end*, i. e. of life; in other words, 'We must persevere, to the last, in maintaining our Christian profession; we must never abandon the confident and joyful hope which it inspires, if we mean to be considered as belonging to the family of Christ.'

7. *Διό, wherefore*, i. e. because Christ is superior to Moses, and has higher claims upon us, hearken, Christian brethren, to the admonitions which I give you, in the words with which the Israelites of old were warned.

Καθὼς λέγει τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον, i. e. as the divine word, given by the influence of the Holy Spirit, saith; comp. Acts 1: 16. 28: 25. This is one of the various ways of appealing to the Scripture, which was usual in the time of the apostles; and which is still practised by our churches. It involves the idea, that the Holy Scriptures are given by divine inspiration, are *θεόπνευστοι*.

Σήμερον, to day, now, at present, like the Hebrew הַיּוֹם, to which it corresponds. *Ἐὰν τῆς φωνῆς αὐτοῦ ἀκούσητε, when* or *whilst ye hear his voice. Ἐὰν, when*, like the Hebrew אִם, to which it corresponds; comp. John 6: 62. 12: 32. 13: 20. 14: 3. So Sept. for אִם, Prov. 3: 24. Is. 24: 13, et alibi. *Τῆς φωνῆς αὐτοῦ*, i. e. his warning voice, his admonition.

8. *Μὴ σκληρύνητε τὰς καρδίας ὑμῶν. To harden the heart*, is to make it insensible. In this case, to harden the heart, is to remain insensible to divine admonition, to neglect it, to act in a contumacious manner. The form *σκληρύνω* is of the later Greek. The classical writers used *σκληροῦν*, and this in a *physical* sense only, not in a *moral* one.

Παραπικρασμῷ corresponds here to the Hebrew מְרִיבָה, *strife, contention*. It is not a classic word; but it is employed by the Septuagint. The meaning of it is, *exacerbation, provocation, embittering*, from *πικραίνω, to be bitter, to embitter*. It is here applied to designate the act of the Israelites, who provoked the displeasure of God; in particular, to their unbelief and murmuring at Massah or Meribah, Ex. 17: 7, and afterwards at other places.

Κατὰ τὴν ἡμέραν τοῦ πειρασμοῦ ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ, when they tempted [God] *in the desert. Κατὰ τὴν ἡμέραν*, Hebrew כְּיוֹם (for כְּבְיוֹם), *as in the day that, when. Πειρασμοῦ, of temptation*, i. e. their unbelief and murmuring put the patience of God to a trial, (speaking after the manner of men). *Πειράζω* means, *to solicit to do*

evil, but also, *to prove, to assay*. When the Scriptures speak of men as *tempting* God, the meaning is, that men do that which puts the divine patience, forbearance, goodness, etc. to a trial, i. e. make it difficult, as it were, to preserve a strict regard to these. Dindorf is mistaken, when he asserts, on this passage, that *πειράζω* is never used by the Greek writers in the sense of *enticing to sin*; for *πειρᾶν* (i. q. *πειράζειν*) *γυναῖκα* is a very common phrase, in the best Greek writers.

9. *Οὗ*, *when*, adverb, i. q. *ὅπου*, as Oecumenius remarks. *Οἱ πατέρες ὑμῶν*, i. e. the ancient Israelites. *Ἐπείρασάν με ἐδοκίμασάν με*, *tried and proved me*, i. e. put me to a thorough trial; the repetition of a synonymous word merely denoting intensity.

Καὶ εἶδον, *although they saw*. So *καί* in John 3: 32. 14: 30. 17: 25. Rev. 3: 1, et al. In the same manner the Hebrew וְ, Gen. 18: 27. Mal. 2: 14, et al. *Τεσσαράκοντα ἔτη* is joined (in the Hebrew) with the following verse, *forty years was I grieved*, etc. But this depends on the punctation system of the Masorites, which the apostle has not followed. In regard to the sense, it matters not with which verb it is joined. If they tempted God forty years, he was grieved by their conduct during the same time; and if he was grieved by them for that time, it was because they tempted him.

10. *Διό*, *wherefore*, i. e. because they tempted me, etc. This word is not in the Hebrew nor Septuagint. The writer has added it to the quotation, in order to render the sense of it more impressive or explicit.

Προσώχθιζα, *I was indignant, was offended at*. The word is Hellenistic. The Greeks use *ὀχθέω* and *ὀχθίζω*. According to etymology, it consists of *πρός*, *to, against, upon*, and *ὄχθη*, *bank, shore*. It is applied primarily to a ship infringing upon the shore, or, as we say, running agróund. It answers to the Hebrew קוּץ, קוּם, מָאַס, etc.

Τῇ γενεᾷ ἐκείνῃ, *the men of that age*, or, as we say in English, *the generation then upon the stage*.

Ἀεὶ πλανῶνται τῇ καρδίᾳ, the corresponding Hebrew is, עַם תֹּעֵי לֵבָב הֵם, *a people of erring heart are they*, the word *ἀεί* having nothing in the Original which corresponds to it. Still, the sense of the Hebrew is tantamount to what the apostle (with the Septua-

gint) has expressed in the Greek. *To err in heart* may mean, either to err in judgment, or in disposition, intention; for the Hebrew לֵבָב, לֵב, and after it the Greek *καρδία*, means, either *animus, judicium*, or, *mens, cogitatio, desiderium*. I understand *καρδία* here as used according to the Hebrew idiom, (in which it is often pleonastic, at least it seems so to us), so that the phrase imports simply, *They always err*, i. e. they are continually departing from the right way.

Αὐτοὶ δὲ οὐκ ἔγνωσαν τὰς ὁδούς μου, neither (*δὲ οὐκ* means, *neither*) *have they approved my doings. Γινώσκω* (like the Hebrew יָדַע, Ps. 1: 6. 36: 11) means, *to approve, to like, to be pleased with*, Matt. 7: 23. John 10: 14, 15, 27. 2 Tim. 2: 19. *Ὁδός* corresponds to the Hebrew דֶּרֶךְ, which means, *counsel, design, purpose*, also *operation, manner of conducting or acting towards any one*. In this last sense, I take the word to be employed here. The meaning is, 'The Israelites had been discontented with the manner in which God had dealt with them in the wilderness; they disapproved his manner of treating them.' See, for an illustration of this, Deut. 8: 2—5. 4: 32—37, and particularly 29: 2—4.

11. *Ὡς, so that*, a conjunction; see Wahl on *ὡς*, II. 2. *Ἐν τῇ ὀργῇ μου, in my indignation*, viz. that which their unbelief and contumacy had excited. Comp. *παραπικρασμῷ* in v. 8th, which means the provocation given by the Israelites.

Εἰ εἰσελεύσονται, they shall not enter. Εἰ borrows its *negative* meaning from the Hebrew אִם, to which it corresponds. The Hebrews used אִם, in the latter clause of an oath which ran thus; *God do so to me,* וכה (אם) *I do thus*, etc. See the full form in 1 Sam. 3: 17. 2 Sam. 3: 35. 2 K. 6: 31. The former part of this oath was sometimes omitted, and אִם had then the force of a strong negative; see 2 Sam. 11: 11. 1 Sam. 14: 45, alibi; vide Ges. Heb. Lex. under אִם, no. 6. So in Ps. 95: 11, אִם יְבֹאוּן contains a strong negative; which the Septuagint (and our author after them) have rendered, *εἰ εἰσελεύσονται*.

The passage exhibits God as speaking after the manner of men, and as affected, like them, with feelings of indignation. The idea conveyed by such expressions plainly is, that God, as a measure of justice to the Israelites for their wickedness, gave solemn assurance that they should not enter into his rest.

Εἰς τὴν κατάπαυσίν μου, Hebrew מְנוּחָתִי, *my rest*, means,

such rest as I enjoy, or such as I have prepared or provided. See more, on the subject of this rest, in the commentary on Chap. IV.

12. *Μήποτε ἔσται ἀπιστίας, lest there be in any of you an evil and unbelieving heart.* *Ἀπιστίας*, of *unbelief*, is here used as an adjective to qualify *καρδία*, according to an idiom very common both in the Old and New Testament.

Ἐν τῷ ἀποστῆναι ἀπὸ θεοῦ ζῶντος, in apostatising from the living God, or rather, *so that he may apostatise*, etc. *Ἀποστῆναι* is *to revolt, to apostatise, to make defection from.* *Θεοῦ ζῶντος, living God*, either in opposition to idols, which had no life; as in Acts 14: 15. 1 Thess. 1: 9. 1 Tim. 4: 10; or, *living* may mean *immortal, eternal*, as probably it does in Heb. 9: 14. 10: 31. 12: 22. 1 Pet. 1: 23, and often in the Old Testament. Thus *perennial* water is called *ζῶν*, John 4: 11. 7: 38. So the commentators and lexicographers. Perhaps, after all, *ζῶν* in such cases may mean, *the author, or giver of life*; comp. John 6: 51, 57. 7: 38.

The sense of the passage taken together is, 'Beware, brethren, of an unbelieving and evil heart, such as the Israelites possessed, lest, like them, you apostatise from the living God,' i. e. lest you apostatise from the religion of Christ, which he has required you to receive and to maintain, and thus perish like ancient Israel who revolted from God.

13. *Ἀλλὰ παρακαλεῖτε ἑαυτούς, but admonish one another.* *Ἑαυτοί*, in the New Testament and in the classics, is often used as the equivalent of *ἀλλήλοι*; and so I understand it here.

Καθ' ἑκάστην ἡμέραν, every day, i. e. constantly, habitually. *Ἄχρις οὗ τὸ σήμερον καλεῖται*, either [*καιροῦ*] *οὗ κ. τ. λ.*, or *οὗ* may be the adverb of time, as in v. 9th. *Καλεῖται*, like the Heb. קָרָא, יִקְרָא, *is*. See Wahl's Lexicon, and Gesenius. The meaning is, 'daily, while you have opportunity, admonish one another.' In *τὸ σήμερον*, the article is joined, (as it often is), with an adverb which expresses the sense of a noun; *constructio ad sensum*.

Ἵνα μὴ σκληρυνθῇ τις ἁμαρτίας, so that no one may be hardened by sinful delusion. *Ἀπάτῃ τῆς ἁμαρτίας* means, the sinful delusion which false teachers or Judaizing zealots might occasion; or, that delusion into which they might be led, by their oppressive condition arising from persecution, or by any allurements of a worldly nature; so that they would become insensible to the warnings which they had received, and might abandon their Chris-

tian profession. This would be a *delusion* indeed, and be highly sinful. *Mutual daily admonition*, the apostle intimates, would tend to prevent this evil.

14. *Μέτοχοι γὰρ τοῦ Χριστοῦ γεγόναμεν, we are*, or, *we shall be partakers of the blessings which Christ bestows.* That *Χριστός* is sometimes put for the Christian religion, and sometimes for the blessings which are proffered by it, may be seen in the lexicons.

Ἐάπερ τὴν ἀρχὴν κατάσχωμεν, if we hold fast, unto the end, our former confidence. Τὴν ἀρχὴν τῆς ὑποστάσεως, i. q. *τὴν πρώτην πίστιν*, 1 Tim. 5: 12. The sentiment is, 'Continue, to the end of life, to exercise confidence in Christ, and you shall obtain the reward which he has promised;' see *μέχρι τέλους*, in v. 6 above.

15. *Ἐν τῷ λέγεσθαι, in respect to what is said*, or, *in regard to the declaration*, viz. the declaration which follows, or, the quotation of what had before been cited. *Ἐν τῷ λέγεσθαι* is equivalent to *ἐν τῷ λέγειν*, 8: 13, or to *κατὰ τὸ λεγόμενον*. The design of this expression is, merely to remind the reader of what had just been cited from the Old Testament, a part only of which is now repeated, and the rest is left to be supplied by the reader's recollection.

Σήμερον ἐὰν κ. τ. λ. now, while (see *ἐάν* v. 7) *you hear his voice*, etc.

16. *Τίνες γὰρ ἀκούσαντες παρεπίκραναν;* So with Griesbach, Knapp, Titmann, and others, I prefer to accent and punctuate this clause. The common editions have *τινές* (accented on the ultimate), and meaning *some*, instead of *τίνες* the *interrogative*, meaning *who?* They also omit the interrogation point after *παρεπίκραναν*. According to this last mode of exhibiting the text, it must be rendered (as in our English version), *For some when they had heard did provoke: howbeit not all that came out of Egypt by Moses;* which is altogether inapposite to the design of the apostle. The true rendering I take to be, *Who now were they, that when they heard did provoke* [the Lord?] Or, *Who, let me ask* (see on *γάρ*, Wahl, no. I. b. *β.*) *were they*, etc. The design of this and the following questions is, to lead the minds of the readers to consider the specific sin, viz. unbelief, which occasioned the ruin of the ancient Israelites, and which would involve their posterity in the like condemnation.

Ἀλλ' οὐ πάντες Μωϋσέως, rather, were they not all who came out of Egypt by Moses? Ἀλλά, rather, or, *nay.* The same

form occurs in Luke 17: 8; "Who of you, having a servant ploughing, or tending sheep, will say to him when he returns from the field, Come and sit down immediately at the table? *Will he not rather say*, or, *nay, will he not say, to him*, (*ἀλλ' οὐχὶ ἐρεῖ αὐτῷ*), *prepare my supper*, etc?" The force of *ἀλλά*, in our text, it is not difficult to perceive. The writer first asks, "Who now were those, that when they had heard divine warnings, still provoked the Lord?" He then, as though the question in this form were almost superfluous, immediately adds, "*Might I not rather ask*, or, *nay, might I not ask*, Did not all who came out of Egypt do this?" He means to intimate by this, that the number who embrace error cannot sanction it; nor can unanimity in unbelief render it any more excusable. Consequently, that the great body of the Jews rejected the Messiah, at the time then present, and urged the Christian converts to do the same, would be no excuse for apostasy. *Πάντες* is not to be taken in the strict metaphysical or mathematical sense here, any more than in multitudes of other places; e. g. '*All* Judea went out to John to be baptised, confessing their sins, Matt. 3: 5, 6;' '*all* men came to Jesus, to be baptised of him, John 3: 26;' and so often. Of the adults, only Caleb and Joshua among the Israelites are excepted, as not having taken part in the murmurings against the Lord, Num. 14: 30. Of course, there could be no scruples in the apostle's mind about applying the word *πάντες* in this case, just as it is applied in a multitude of others, viz. to designate *great multitudes* or *the great majority*.

Διὰ Μωϋσέως, by Moses, means under his guidance, by his instrumentality.

17. *Τίσι δὲ ἔτη, and with whom was he indignant for forty years?* Above, in the quotation v. 10, *forty years* is connected with *εἶδον τὰ ἔργα μου*. But the sense of the whole passage is not materially changed, by the manner of expression in v. 17. It is true that the Israelites saw the works of the Lord for forty years, and that he expressed his indignation against them during that time, until the generation who had rebelled were destroyed.

Οὐχὶ τοῖς ἁμαρτήσασι; was it not with those who had sinned? Ernesti and Dindorf labour to shew that *ἁμαρτάνω* means the same here as *ἀπειθέω*. Doubtless it includes the sin of *unbelief*; but it is of itself more generic than *ἀπειθέω*, and includes various sins of

the Israelites, such as rebellion, murmurings, etc., the consequence of unbelief.

Τὰ κῶλα, lit. *members*, such as arms, legs. It is here put, however, by synecdoche, for the *whole body*, and corresponds to the Hebrew פְּגָרִים, *corpses*, in Num. 14: 29, 32; to which passages the apostle here refers. Ἔπεσε in Greek, and the corresponding Hebrew נָפַל, are both used to designate the *prostrate condition of dead bodies*, or, *the falling down dead*. The whole phrase may be thus paraphrased, 'Who perished in the desert.'

18. Τίσι δὲ ὤμοσε . . . κατάπαυσιν αὐτοῦ; *to whom did he swear* (see Num. 14: 23, 28—30. Deut. 1: 34, 35), *that they should not enter into his rest, except to those who disbelieved?*

In Num. 14: 23, 28—30, is an account of an oath, on the part of Jehovah, that the rebellious Israelites should not enter into *the land*, which he had sworn to their fathers should be given to them, i. e. in case they were obedient. In Deut. 1: 34, 35, there is another mention of a like oath, viz, that they should not enter into *the goodly land*, pledged by oath to their fathers. But in neither case is the word, *rest*, employed. The reasoning of the apostle, however, in the chapter before us, would lead us to suppose, that the manner in which the unbelieving Jews were declared, in the above passages, to be excluded from *the goodly land*, and the *reasons* stated for that exclusion, necessarily implied exclusion from the heavenly Canaan also, or, from *the rest of God*.

19. Καὶ βλέπομεν δι' ἀπιστίαν, *we see, then, that they could not enter in, because of unbelief.* Καί, *then*, in the apodosis of a sentence, or in a connected series of reasoning, as here. See Wahl on καί, II. 2, and comp. Gesen. Heb. Lex. on ו, no. 5.

The writer having thus appealed, for the sake of warning, to the example and consequences of unbelief among the Israelites of old in the wilderness, proceeds now further to confirm the application of what he had been saying to those whom he addressed, and to remove objections which might be raised against this application. Two objections, he seems to apprehend, might probably be raised against the use which he had made of the citation from the Old Testament; the one, that the rest there spoken of meant only, *a rest in the land of Canaan*, or, the quiet possession of the promised earthly inheritance; the other, that the ancient Israelites were excluded from the promised rest, on account of murmuring and rebellion, crimes not charged upon those whom the apostle addressed. The writer has deemed it expedient, and it was proper, that both of these objections to the use which he had made of the Old Testament Scripture should be removed, before he proceeded further with his main design.

In 4: 1, he brings forward the assertion, that the promise of entering into the rest of God still remains, addressed to the Hebrew Christians, as it was to the Israelites of old. In v. 2, he proceeds to repeat the idea, (for the sake of deeply impressing it), that blessings are announced to us (to Christians) in like manner as to the ancient Hebrews; and he now adds, that *they* failed to obtain the proffered blessings *through unbelief*. These declarations involve two propositions; the first, that the blessings in question must be of a spiritual nature; the second, that unbelief is the great cause of that sin, which excludes from the enjoyment of them. The last of these propositions he does not *formally* labour to establish, as he does the other: because the evidence of it is involved in the quotation which he had made, in chap. 2: 7—11; for it is there affirmed, that after all which the Israelites had seen of the works of God, for forty years, in the desert, they still tempted and provoked him, i. e. they gave no credit to all the testimonies which he had set before them of his fidelity toward his promises, and of his love and pity for them; *nor did they believe* his comminations against the disobedient. Consequently, they were excluded, by this *unbelief*, from his rest.

But what is the *rest* in question? Is it quiet possession of the land of Canaan? No, says the apostle. Believers *now* enter into the rest (v. 3), i. e. the same kind of rest as was anciently proffered. Moreover, God calls it κατάπαυσίν μου, MY *rest*, i. e. (adds he) such rest as God enjoyed, after he had completed the creation of the world; consequently *spiritual, heavenly* rest. This is plain, (as he goes on to show in v. 4), from what the Scripture says, Gen. 2: 2, concerning *the rest of God*. Again, it is involved in the very form of expression, in Ps. 95: 11, viz. MY *rest*, v. 5.

'Now,' continues he (v. 6), 'as some must enter into the rest in question,' (for surely God would not provide and proffer a rest altogether in vain); 'and since they, to whom it was offered, lost it through *unbelief*—[it follows that *believers* only can attain to it.]' But this last idea the author has not *expressed*. He has left the reader to supply it; as he may do without any difficulty, from what the writer had already said in vs. 2, 3. The illustration and confirmation of this truth, is plainly one of the objects which the writer has in view, (as was stated above); and while vs. 3—5 shew that the rest spoken of is of a *heavenly* nature; the object of v. 6 is, to intimate that *unbelief* was the sin which excluded from it.

But lest there might still be some doubt about the nature of the *rest* to which the ancient Scriptures refer, the writer resumes the argument respecting the nature of it, and adduces other considerations, to shew that it must be spiritual and heavenly.

'Moreover,' says he (v. 7), 'David himself, (who lived nearly five centuries after the land of promise had been occupied by the Israelites)—David speaks of a definite time, then present, in which he warns his cotemporaries against losing the rest which God had promised to the believing and obedient; (a rest of the same nature as that from which the Israelites of old had been excluded, as may be seen in Ps. 95).' 'Now,' (adds he), 'if Joshua, who gave Israel possession of the land of Canaan, had given them the *rest* to which the Scripture refers when it speaks of *God's rest*, then the Psalmist could not have spoken, so many centuries afterwards, of a rest that was still proffered to Israel, and from which the unbelieving would be excluded, v. 9.' 'Hence,' he concludes, 'it is evident, since the rest which is spoken of is not of a temporal nature, but of a spiritual enduring nature, that there remains a rest for the people of God, i. e. believers.'

That the main object of the writer, in chap. 4: 1—9, is to prove the spiritual and abiding

nature of the proffered rest, is stated so explicitly in v. 10, that there can be no reasonable doubt left in respect to his intention; "For," says he, "he who enters into his [God's] rest, rests from his own labours, as God did from his." That is, he who attains to the rest proffered to Israel in the time of David, and to the more ancient Israelites in the wilderness, attains to a rest like that of God, (described in Gen. 2: 2); i. e. he will rest from the toils, and trials, and sorrows of a probationary state, and enjoy a happiness heavenly and divine, in a better world above.

The writer then proceeds, in his usual manner, to close the topic by adding exhortations diligently to seek the rest in question, and awful warnings against incurring, by unbelief, the righteous indignation of that holy and omnipotent Judge, unto whom their account must be rendered, vs. 11—13.

In regard to the views of our author, relative to the subject of the *rest*, which is proffered in the Old Testament to all who are believing and obedient, they doubtless differ very much from many commentators and critics of the present day, who are distinguished for their literary attainments. But it will not follow from this, that they are erroneous. Certain it is, that all the writers of the New Testament had similar views, respecting the spiritual nature of some of the promises contained in the Jewish Scriptures. I cannot, therefore, regard the passage which we have just considered, as a mere *accommodation* (a somewhat forced one too) of promises and threatenings addressed to Israel of old, that had respect only to the land of Canaan; nor as a mere *fanciful* application of things ancient, to the Hebrews whom our author is addressing. I cannot help believing, at all events, that As regarded the rest spoken of in Ps. 95: 11 and Gen. 2: 2, as spiritual and heavenly rest. Consequently, an appeal to the examples contained in the Old Testament, is more to the point, and more forcible, when thus understood, than it would be in any other mode of explaining the views and design of the writer.

As to the *mode of reasoning*, in order to establish the positions which the writer has in view, it is quite different, indeed, from that to which we now resort, who have the whole of the New Testament in our hands, in which "life and immortality are brought [so fully] to light." *We* need to take but very little pains, in order to prove that promises of *rest* in a *future* world, promises respecting a spiritual and heavenly country, are made to Christians. But we must remember, while we are labouring to understand the reasoning of Paul in the chapter before us, that the Hebrews whom he addressed had no New Testament; for some of it was not yet written, and none of it had acquired a general circulation among the Christian churches. This is the reason why Paul, in all his epistles, whenever he has occasion to quote Scripture, uniformly quotes the Old Testament only. How could he appeal to the New Testament, which was, when he wrote our epistle, only in a forming state, and was not completed until after his death? Indeed, it was not embodied in its present form, and generally circulated among the Christian churches, until nearly a century after the death of Paul.

This may suffice to shew why Paul appeals to the Old Testament, and not to the New, when he designs to establish any thing from the sacred oracles. Every one, moreover, who believes, with Paul, that the "gospel has brought life and immortality to light," will of course suppose it to be more difficult, to establish promises of *rest in a future world* from the Old Testament than from the New. Hence, he may be less forcibly struck with the argument of Paul, in Heb. IV. to prove a promise of future happiness to believers, than he will with many an argument which his own mind will supply from the New Testament. And with good reason. The New Testament does afford arguments far more explicit and convincing than the Old; and of course more powerful arguments than those which Paul deduces, in our chapter, from the Old. But this is no fault in the writer of our epistle. It is merely a result of the circumstances in which he, and those whom he addressed, were placed. He had asserted, in writing to them, that a promise of the same nature was proffered to Christians, as was proffered to the ancient Israelites, 4: 1, 2. The consequence he deduces from this is, that an unbelief with respect to this promise occasioned their ruin, so the like unbelief would now produce the like consequences. Nothing could be better adapted to his purpose, when writing to the Hebrews, than to produce an example of the consequences of unbelief, that was taken from their own progenitors, and recorded in their own Scriptures which they acknowledged as the word of God. To the New Testament he could not appeal, for it was not then in their hands. To the Old Testament Scriptures, then, he chooses (and for the best of reasons) to make the

appeal, in establishing the assertion he had made, that a promise of entering into the rest of God was still left; that the proffered blessing was announced to Christians in the same manner as to God's ancient people, 4: 1, 2; and that it would be conferred only on those who remained firm in their belief.

The whole argument is, indeed, in some sense, *argumentum ad hominem*. It is appropriate to the time, to the circumstances in which the apostle wrote, and to the people whom he addressed. But who can, with any propriety, make it a matter of accusation against the writer, that he consulted the good of those whom he addressed, by arguing with them in a manner that was most appropriate to their condition? Did not the Saviour constantly do the same? And ought we not to follow his example?

It is indeed true, that the views of the apostle, in respect to what is revealed in the Old Testament with regard to a future state, were plainly very different from those of many commentators and critics, who represent the Jews, God's chosen people and favoured with the light of revelation, as more profoundly ignorant of the doctrine of immortality, and of future rewards and punishments, than any of their heathen neighbours; a thing as improbable in itself, as it is contrary to the reasoning of the apostle, on which I have been commenting. Nor is it at all necessary to maintain, with most of the recent commentators, that Paul *allegorizes* the *rest of Canaan* here, in such a way as to accommodate himself to the spirit of the age in which he lived, and the taste of the Jews who were his cotemporaries. So far am I from embracing this view of the subject, that I am quite persuaded, he has designedly undertaken to shew, that the interpretation his cotemporaries put upon the passage which respects *exclusion from the rest of God*, was an erroneous one. Plainly he labours to shew, that *rest in the land of Canaan* could NOT possibly have been meant by the Psalmist. Where then is the *allegorizing* of the apostle here, of which so much has been said? Who can say confidently, against the reasoning and the decision of Paul, that the rest of which David spake, was not *spiritual*? I content myself, whatever others may do, with the exegesis of the apostle; and do fully believe that he is in the right.

If he is correct in his views, then it follows, that the future punishment of the unbelieving Israelites is clearly intimated, by the exclusion from spiritual or heavenly rest which is threatened. This is a necessary inference from the reasoning and conclusions of the apostle.

CHAP. IV.

1. *Φωβηθῶμεν, let us beware*, lit. *let us be afraid of*. As fear, however, in its *literal* sense, is not applicable in this case, the exact shade of meaning is, *caveamus, let us beware*.

Καταλειπομένης ἐπαγγελίας, a promise being still left. *Καταλείπω*, according to both sacred and classic usage, may mean, *to forsake, desert, neglect*; e. g. in Acts 6: 2. 2 Pet. 2: 15, et al. In this sense many critics have understood it, in the passage now in question. The sense then would be, 'Let us beware, lest by neglect of the promise made to us, etc.' But I much prefer the other sense of the word, i. e. *to leave behind*, and (passively) *to be left behind, to remain, to be still extant*; e. g. in Acts 24: 27. Luke 20: 31. Mark 12: 19, al. and especially comp. v. 9 below. The meaning then is, that the promise, which was implicitly made to believers among the ancient people of God, is still in being, and is made to

us, i. e. to Christians. This the next verse so directly asserts, as to render the interpretation just given nearly certain.

Ἐπαγγελίας, *declaration, announciation, promise*, i. e. announciation of the reward offered to the believing or faithful.

Μήποτε δοκῇ τις ἐξ ὑμῶν ὑστερηκέναι, lest any one of you may fail of obtaining it. By sacred and classical usage, δοκέω is frequently joined with other verbs, without making any *essential* addition to the sense of them; i. e. it is said to be used *pleonastically;* by which, however, can be meant only, that it is incapable of being precisely rendered into our own language, and *apparently* adds nothing to the sense of a phrase. But this is not exactly true of δοκέω. In many cases, it is plainly designed to soften the expression to which it is attached; e. g. 1 Cor. 7: 40, Paul says, δοκῶ δὲ κἀγὼ πνεῦμα θεοῦ ἔχειν, *I seem to myself to possess the Spirit of God;* a modest way of asserting the fact, instead of speaking categorically. In a similar way δοκέω is employed, in 1 Cor. 14: 37. 10: 12, ὁ δοκῶν ἑστάναι, he *who seems to himself to stand;* 3: 18. 4: 9. In a few cases, it is difficult to distinguish what addition is made to the phrase, by the use of δοκέω; e. g. Luke 22: 24, τίς αὐτῶν δοκεῖ εἶναι μείζων, i. q. τίς εἴη. So Luke 8: 18, ὃ δοκεῖ ἔχειν is expressed, in Luke 19: 26, by ὃ ἔχει. 1 Cor. 11: 16, εἰ δέ τις δοκεῖ φιλόνεικος εἶναι. There can scarcely be a doubt, however, that in all cases, the Greeks designed to give some colouring to a sentence, by employing it. It would often seem to be something near to our *may, might, can, could*, etc. when used to soften forms of expression that might have been categorical. So Theophylact understood it, in our phrase. The words δοκεῖ τις ὑστερηκέναι, he thus explains; "τουτέστι, μηπὼς ὑστερήσῃ, lest he may come short—and fail to enter into the promised rest. *The writer uses a mild and gentle address*, not saying μὴ ὑστερήσῃ, but μὴ δοκῇ ὑστερηκέναι. Theophylact in loc." This, I apprehend, is hitting the exact force of the phrase here; an imperfect view of which is given in the lexicons.

Ἐξ ὑμῶν, in some manuscripts and fathers, ἡμῶν; which would better accord with the usual κοινωσις of the writer; e. g. 1: 1. 2: 1, 3. 3: 1, 6, 19, al. But it is not an unusual thing for Paul to change or intermingle different persons, in the same passage; e. g. Rom. 14: 13. Heb. 10: 24, 25.

Ὑστερέω lit. means, *to come afterwards, to come late.* In the

secondary sense it means, *to fail, to come short of;* as he must fail of obtaining a thing, who comes too late for it. If the exhortation here be regarded as having a special reference to the *time* (σήμερον), when the offers of rest are made, μήποτε ὑστερηκέναι may be rendered happily, as in Wahl, *lest ye come too late*, i. e. after σήμερον. But I prefer the more simple method; *lest ye fail of obtaining the promised blessing.*

2. *Καὶ γάρ ἐσμεν εὐαγγελισμένοι, for to us also are blessings announced*, or, *we are evangelized*, i. e. the promise of blessings is declared or made known to us, *as well as to them. Εὐαγγελίζω* is used classically in the same sense, i. e. *to announce joyful tidings, to proclaim proffered good.* The proffered blessing, implied in the text, is *the rest* of which the writer had been speaking, and of which he continues to speak.

Ἀλλ' οὐκ ὠφέλησεν ὁ λόγος τῆς ἀκοῆς, the promise or *declaration which they heard*, [or, *which was proclaimed*], *was of no benefit to them. Ὁ λόγος τῆς ἀκοῆς* may be equivalent to *ὁ ἀκουσθεὶς λόγος*, i. e. the word heard by them; or it may be like the Hebrew דְּבַר שְׁמוּעָה, *word of annunciation* or *report*, i. e. word announced or reported. The sense is not materially changed, whichever of these interpretations is adopted.

Συγκεκραμένος ἀκούσασι, not being joined with faith in them that heard it, or, *not being united to faith*, i. e. faith not accompanying it, or associating with it. *Συγκεκραμένος* is explained, by many commentators, as being tropically employed here; and the metaphor, they allege, is taken from food, which when digested unites with the corporeal system, and becomes aliment to it. So here, the *word*, if duly received, would have incorporated itself, so to speak, with the internal, spiritual man; but as it was not received, it did not so incorporate itself. But this is not so simple and easy a mode of explanation, as that given in the above translation.

Many manuscripts and editions read *συγκεκραμένους*, and some *συγκεκερασμένους*; which some critics and interpreters prefer. But it is difficult, if not impossible, to make any tolerable sense of these readings. The common one is much preferable.

Τοῖς ἀκούσασι—equivalent here to the genitive *τῶν ἀκουσάντων*. The meaning is, that the *λόγος* was not associated with the faith of *those who heard it.* The Hebrews usually designate possession, by the dative with לְ; e. g. *the Song of songs*, אֲשֶׁר לִשְׁלֹמֹה

which is Solomon's. So, frequently, in Greek; e. g. *οἱ πατήρ his father*, Pind. Olymp. 1: 91. *Neither do thy children* [*σοι τέκνα*] *see the light*, Eurip. Phoeniss. 1563. *Men are one κτημάτων τοῖς θεοῖς, of the possessions of the gods*, Plato. Phaed. See Matt. Gr. Gram. § 392. g. 1. et seq. In all such cases, there is an ellipsis of a pronoun relating to the object possessed, and of the verb of existence, which governs the dative when it signifies possession or property; e. g. *κτημάτων* [*ἃ ἐστι*] *τοῖς θεοῖς.*

The sense of the whole verse is simply this; 'a promise of rest is made to Christians now, as well as to God's ancient people. But they received no advantage from it, because of unbelief;' the implication is, *φοβηθῶμεν*, (as he had just said), *μή τις δοκῇ κ. τ. λ*, that is, Guard well, then, against unbelief.

3. *Εἰσερχόμεθα γὰρ πιστεύσαντες, but we who believe do enter into the rest*, viz. God's rest. *Γάρ, but;* for plainly *εἰσερχόμεθα γάρ* is put in distinction from the preceding *ἀλλ' οὐκ ὠφέλησε*, to which the writer subjoins, *but* (*γάρ*) *we who do believe, are profited by it*, etc. It may also be rendered, nearly to the same purpose, *still*, or, *yet* (*γάρ*), *we who do believe*, etc. provided the preceding *ἀλλ'* be translated, *although*. The sentiment of the two clauses is either this; 'Be it that the unbelievers reaped no advantage from the rest proffered to them, yet we who are believers do enter into that rest;' which the writer then proceeds to prove: or it may be stated in another form, thus, 'An offer of rest is made to us, as well as to them; *but* (*ἀλλ'*) unbelief excluded them from that rest; we, *then* (*γάρ*), who believe shall be admitted to it.' That is, if our character be the opposite of theirs, then will our lot be the opposite also.

Εἰσερχόμεθα, in the *present* tense, appears to have created difficulty in the minds of some critics, who have changed it into *εἰσελευσόμεθα* (future tense). But how needless this change is, every one conversant with the idiom of the Bible may easily judge; in which the *present* tense is very often used as a *universal* tense, embracing time past, present, and future. In Hebrew, it is very common to use the *present* participle, for the same purposes as the Latins use their future in *rus.*

Καθὼς εἴρηκεν· κ. τ. λ. that is, a solemn asseveration that *unbelievers* should *not* enter into his rest, implies, of course, that *believers* should enter into it. See on 3: 11.

Καίτοι τῶν ἔργων γενηθέντων, namely, [rest from] *the works that were done after the world was founded. Καίτοι* is a particle, the meaning of which has been much controverted here. There is no doubt, that it sometimes has the meaning of *although*, which our English version has here given to it. But I am unable to make any sense of the passage, under consideration, if *καίτοι* be thus translated. Nor does *καίτοι* seem originally to mean, *although*. Its principal signification is, *et quidem, et sane.* So Xenophon (Cyrop. III.), *καίτοι, εἴτε ἐκείνους μὲν φοβερωτέρους ποιήσομεν κ. τ. λ. and truly, if we shall make them somewhat more timid,* etc. Thucyd. IV. 60, *καίτοι, γνῶναι χρὴ κ. τ. λ. and truly, we ought to know.* Aristoph. Plut. 1179, *καίτοι τότε, ὅτι εἶχον οὐδέν, and indeed then, when they possessed nothing.* "Adhibetur," says Hoogeveen, "cum sequitur aliquid nova attentione dignum;" and again, "Quartus usus est, *si dictum exemplo confirmatur,*" (Hoog. Doctrina Part. Graec. ed Schütz. vocab. *καίτοι*); which is the very case in question. For here the writer gives the example of God's rest after the creation, in order to explain what is the meaning of MY *rest.* I have given the sense, by rendering *καίτοι, namely*, which is equivalent in many cases to *et quidem, et sane.* So Devarius (de Partic. Ling. Graec.) explains *καίτοι*; and after him Carpzoff, (Comm. in loc. nostrum). The latter says, "Devarius evicit, eam (*καίτοι*) simpliciter ad exponendam aliquam sententiam poni." The sense will be substantially the same, if *καίτοι* be rendered, *and truly, and indeed;* but the other mode of translating is more explicit, and makes the connexion more facile.

Τῶν ἔργων, [rest from] *the works.* That *κατάπαυσιν* is to be understood, before *ἔργων*, is clear from vs. 4 and 10, where the same sentiment is repeated. The ellipsis may be either [*κατάπαυσιν*] *τῶν ἔργων*, or, [*κατάπαυσιν ἀπὸ*] *τῶν ἔργων*; more probably the latter, for *ἀπό* is supplied after the verb *κατέπαυσε*, both in vs. 4 and 10. *Ἀπό*, however, is not absolutely *necessary* here, as nothing is more common than for the genitive case, without any preposition, to mean *in respect to, in regard to;* e. g. *ἐγγύτατα αὐτῷ εἰμι, γένους, I am very nearly allied to him,* IN REGARD TO *descent; ἄπαις ἀῤῥένων παίδων, childless* IN REGARD TO *males;* see Buttmann's Gram. § 119. 6. 1. Matthiae, § 315.

Ἀπὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου γενηθέντων, done, i. e. completed or performed, *when the world was founded. Ἀπὸ καταβολῆς, as* or

after the foundation, i. e. beginning; in a sense, like *ἀπὸ ἀρχῆς, at first*, in Matt. 19: 4; and in Luke 13: 25, *ἀφ' οὗ* means, *when*. Josephus uses *καταβολή* for *beginning*; e. g. Lib. II. 17, Bell. Jud. he says, "This was *καταβολὴ πολέμου, the beginning of the war*," viz. with the Romans.

By rendering *ἀπό*, *after*, I follow the more usual sense of the word. The nature of the image I take to be this. The *foundation* (*καταβολή*) of a building is merely its commencement, a state or condition preparatory to the completion of the superstructure. So here, the *καταβολή*, *founding* of the earth, was the act described in Gen. 1: 1. The completion of the building (so to speak) followed, during the work of the six days which succeeded. These were the *ἔργων γενεθέντων* which our author mentions here, and these were the works from which God rested, after they were completed. That *ἀπό*, joined with nouns designating time, may mean *after*, *since*, every lexicon will shew.

4. The writer now proceeds to cite a passage of Scripture, in order to shew that God did enjoy such a rest as he had spoken of. *Εἴρηκε γάρ, for* [the Scripture] *says*, or, [the Holy Ghost] *says*; the usual mode of appealing to the Old Testament.

Πού, in a certain place or *passage*. Chapter and verse are no where cited in the New Testament; and very rarely is any particular book named, unless indeed it bears the same name as its author. An appeal to Scripture, by merely saying *πού*, shews that the writer must have supposed his readers to be familiar with the contents of the Jewish Scriptures. The passage cited may be found in Gen. 2: 2.

Κατέπαυσεν ὁ θεός. The *rest* here spoken of, is of course to be considered as described *ἀνθρωποπαθῶς*, i. e. in accommodation to the capacities of men. It surely does not imply, that God was *wearied* by his work of creation; but that he simply ceased from it, and enjoyed a holy and delightful quiet, in the pleasing contemplation of the works which had been accomplished. Comp. Gen. 1: 4, 10, 18, 25, 31.

5. Such, then, was the rest of God, of which the Scripture speaks. To such rest, the apostle says, the writer of the 95th Psalm refers. *Καὶ ἐν τούτῳ πάλιν, again in this passage also*, viz. in the passage which he had already quoted from Ps. 95: 11, i. e. the passage which he is now going to mention, the Scripture represents

God as saying, MY *rest*, i. e. such rest as I have, or, such as I enjoy. In other words, both Gen. 2: 2 and Ps. 95: 11, speak of a *holy, spiritual rest*, since they speak of a rest which God himself enjoys.

6. *Ἐπεὶ οὖν ἀπολείπεται δι' ἀπείθειαν, since then it remains, that some must enter into that* [rest], *and* [since] *they to whom the promise was formerly announced, did not enter in, because of unbelief;* [it follows that believers only can enter in], comp. v. 3; or, [it follows, that a rest remains for believers], comp. v. 9.

This seems to be a continuation of the subject in v. 3. There the writer says, 'Believers enter into the rest of God.' How is this proved? 'Because he has sworn, that *unbelievers* shall not enter into it;' which necessarily implies that *believers* shall enter into it. Then after delaying a moment, in order to shew what the nature of the rest in question is, viz. that it is *God's rest*, i. e. such rest as God enjoyed after the work of creation was completed (vs. 3—5), the author resumes the consideration of the proposition advanced in the first part of v. 3, and avers, that, as some must enter into God's rest, (for God could not be supposed to have provided one in vain); and as *unbelievers* cannot enter in; so it is necessarily implied, that *believers*, and they only, will enjoy the rest in question. See the illustration of the reasoning, prefixed to chap. IV. in the preceding pages.

Others construe the verse in this manner; 'Since, then, some must enter into his rest, and unbelievers of former days did not enter in; therefore he defines again (πάλιν) a *particular day*, etc;' constructing vs. 6 and 7 as one connected sentence. But this makes the sentence very much involved, and obscures the design of the writer. His object certainly is, to shew that the rest proffered in ancient times, in the 95th Psalm, still remains for the people of God; see vs. 9, 10. But how can this be proved, by merely shewing that David speaks of a definite time, when he wrote the 95th Psalm, in which the offer of rest was *then* made? On the other hand, I understand it to be the particular object of the writer, in v. 7, seq., to exhibit further proof, that the proffered rest is of a *spiritual* nature, and therefore not to be limited by assigning to it a merely *temporal* sense. See the preceding illustration, referred to above.

7. *Πάλιν τινὰ ὁρίζει ἡμέραν καρδίας ὑμῶν, again he specifies a particular day,* TO-DAY, *when speaking by David, so long a time afterwards; as it is said, "To-day whilst ye hear his voice.*

harden not your hearts." See above, on chap. 3: 7, 8, particularly 3: 18. The reasoning stands thus; 'In David's time, nearly five hundred years after unbelievers in the wilderness were threatened with exclusion from the promised inheritance, the Psalmist makes use of the commination which has been quoted, in order to deter those whom he addressed from hardening their hearts as the ancient Israelites did, and so losing the rest, as they did, which God had proffered to the obedient and believing.' This rest, then, could not be merely *the land of Canaan*, (as the Jews of Paul's time understood it to be), for this both believers and unbelievers, living in the time of the Psalmist, already enjoyed. Consequently, the *rest* spoken of by the Psalmist was of a *spiritual* nature, pertaining only to believers. All this is plainly implied in verse

8. *Εἰ γὰρ αὐτοὺς Ἰησοῦς ἡμέρας, now, if Joshua had given them rest*, i. e. the rest of God, of which the Scripture speaks, *then he* [David] *would not have spoken of another time*, viz. when rest was to be given, or to be obtained. That is, 'If the *rest of God* be only the rest of Israel in Canaan, or the quiet possession of the promised land, then the Psalmist could not have spoken of it as still proffered, in his time, after it had been in fact given to Israel by Joshua, nearly five centuries before. The *other time*, here spoken of, is the same which is designated by the word σήμερον in the quotation; which implies a time different from that, and subsequent to that, in which the Israelites obtained the rest of Canaan.

That Ἰησοῦς means *Joshua* here, there can be no doubt; for the object of the writer is to prove, that Jesus *does* bestow the rest spoken of, viz. that which the Ἰησοῦς here named did *not* bestow. *Κατέπαυσε, caused to rest*, exactly as the Hiphil conj. in Hebrew is used; e. g. וַיָּנַח (from נוּחַ) in Deut. 12: 10, in the same sense as κατέπαυσε here.

9. *Ἄρα ἀπολείπεται ... τοῦ θεοῦ, consequently, there remaineth a rest for the people of God*, i. e. for believers, see v. 3. Here, the object of the preceding argument is plainly developed; so plainly, that we are not left at liberty to doubt concerning it. Here is fully *expressed*, what is plainly *implied* in v. 6, although in an elliptical manner, as has been already noticed. Such a manner is not unfrequent with Paul. Comp. Rom. 5: 12 with 5: 18, 19. See Intr. § 22. 3.

Σαββατισμός, (Heb. שַׁבָּת, שַׁבָּתוֹן, *rest, sabbatism,*) *holy, reli-*

gious, spiritual rest. Σαββατισμός is a mere Hebrew word with a Greek ending; and it is here employed as equivalent to κατάπαυσις, but with special reference to the Heb. expression שַׁבָּת (from שָׁבַת) in Gen. 2: 2, which there describes the *rest* of God. The Heb. שַׁבָּתוֹן is a kind of intensive noun, formed from שַׁבָּת, and means, *sabbath by way of eminence.* Σαββατισμός, which stands for שַׁבָּתוֹן, seems to be a word coined by the writer purposely for the occasion, and is very appropriate to his design.

That believers do enter into the *rest of God*, i. e. a rest like his, is further shewn, by verse

10. Ὁ γὰρ εἰσελθὼν ὁ θεός, *he who enters into his* [God's] *rest, he will also cease from his own labours, as God did from his.* As God ceased from his work on the seventh day, and enjoyed holy delight in the contemplation of what he had done, (see on verse 4 above), so the believer, in a future world, will cease from all his toils and sufferings here, and look back with holy delight, on the struggles through which he has past, and the labours which he has performed, for the sake of the Christian cause. Or, as God enjoys a most pure and perfect rest or happiness in heaven; so the believer will enjoy a similar happiness there.

There surely is no more difficulty in calling that rest, which is promised to believers, *the rest of God*, than there is in saying, that man "was formed in his image;" that Christians "are made partakers of the divine nature;" or that "we shall be like him, when when we shall see him as he is." *The rest of God*, is rest like that which God enjoys. And it deserves to be noticed, that the writer, in order to illustrate the nature of this rest, has chosen the description of it, as following the work of creation, in order to make a comparison between it and that rest which believers will have, when all their toils and sufferings are ended. This was well adapted to take hold of the minds of those to whom he was writing, and who were exposed to many hardships and trials.

Having now shewn that there is a promise of spiritual rest to believers, implied in what the Jewish Scriptures say, the apostle repeats the caution, which lay so near his heart, against unbelief in the Saviour and the consequences of it.

11. Σπουδάσωμεν οὖν ἀπειθείας, *let us earnestly endeavour, then, to enter into that rest,* [the rest of God], *lest any one should perish, in like manner, through unbelief.* Ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ ὑπο-

δείγματι, after the same example, after the like manner, viz. as they (the Israelites) perished. *Πέσῃ* is often used in this way, in an *intransitive* sense. *Ἀπειθείας* I take to be the genitive (as grammarians say) of *means, instrument*, etc.

The awful nature of the commination, that unbelievers should not enter into the *rest of God*, the writer now describes, in order to leave a deep impression on the minds of his readers, and to guard them more effectually against unbelief and apostasy.

12. *Ζῶν γὰρ ἐνεργής, for the declaration of God has an active and mighty power*, or, *is enduring and powerful*, i. e. has an efficiency that never ceases. The meaning according to the latter interpretation is, that the commination, uttered in ancient days against unbelievers, (and which had been repeated above by the writer), has abated nothing from its force or efficacy, down to the present time; it still lives; unbelievers are still subject to its power. In defence of this interpretation, it might be said that *ζῶν* is applied here to the *divine word*, i. e. commination, in a manner like that in which it is applied to God in the phrase אֵל חַי, *θεὸς ζῶν*, often used in the Scriptures, which designates him as *eternal, immortal, never dying, endowed with unfailing life*, in opposition to idols destitute of a living principle, and made of perishable materials. It is evident, too, that the sense of *perpetual* or *perennial*, may be considered as appropriate to the passage before us.

But others interpret *ζῶν* as meaning, *active*, a sense which is common to this word, and to the Hebrew חַי. I understand both terms as conveying the idea of *active and mighty energy*; which is altogether appropriate to the writer's purpose, whose object it is to persuade his hearers, that the commination uttered against the unbelievers of former days and which is still in force, has a dreadful power, at which they ought to shudder.

Καὶ τομώτερος δίστομον, and sharper than any two-edged sword, i. e. it has a more effective power to inflict wounds, than a sword with two edges. The efficacy of divine commination is often compared to a sharp sword. E. g. the Son of man is represented by John, as having, when he appeared to him in vision, a sharp two-edged sword issuing from his mouth, i. e. his words cut as it were like a sharp sword, or his reproof, commination, wounded deeply, Rev. 1: 16. 2: 12, 16. 19: 15, 21. Comp. also Is. 49: 2. 11: 4, in which last passage the expression is, *with the rod of*

his mouth, and in the parallel στόμα, *with the breath of his lips* [with his words] *shall he slay the wicked*. Language then of reproof, of severe threats or commination, or of condemnation, is by the sacred writers called the *sword* or *rod of the mouth*. So in our verse, the divine commination is represented as terribly efficacious, by resorting to the same species of imagery in order to make a comparison.

Καὶ διϊκνούμενος πνεύματος. The writer continues the description of the efficacy of the divine threatening, by carrying on still further the description of the effects produced by a sharp sword upon the natural body. *Piercing even so as to separate life and spirit*. Ψυχή, when used as here, in distinction from πνεῦμα, means the *animal* soul or principle of *animal* life in man; as πνεῦμα in such a case means, the *rational* or *intellectual* soul, the *immaterial* principle within man. See 1 Thess. 5: 23, where σῶμα is added, in order to designate the merely *physical* or *corporeal* part of the human system. In the phrase under consideration, *piercing so as to divide* [or separate] *life and spirit*, plainly means inflicting a wound so deep as shall prove deadly; for that which separates the soul from the system endowed with animal life, is of course deadly. We may paraphrase both expressions thus; *a sharp sword that inflicts deadly wounds*.

Ἁρμῶν τε καὶ μυελῶν, [piercing so as to divide] *joints and marrow*, i. e. so as to divide the joints or limbs from the body, (which was often done in the severer kinds of punishment); and so as to pierce through the very bone to the marrow, or to separate the marrow from the bone, by perforating it; a tremendous image of the sharpness of the sword and the effects it produces. The sense is, that the divine commination is of *most deadly* punitive efficacy.

Καὶ κριτικὸς . . . καρδίας, he also judges [takes cognisance of] *the desires and purposes of the heart*, i. e. θεὸς κριτικός ἐστι. That κριτικός, *aptus ad judicandum*, here applies to God, and not to λόγος, seems evident. That there is a transition to θεός, is quite evident from v. 13, where ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ, ὀφθαλμοῖς αὐτοῦ, and πρὸς ὅν, one cannot well doubt, are to be applied to God. There is, then, a transition somewhere to θεός; and the nature of the case shews, that the appropriate place for it is at καὶ κριτικός. In the preceding part of the verse, λόγος θεοῦ, *divine commination*,

is represented (very forcibly and properly) as *punitive*. This idea is consummated by the phrase which ends with μυελῶν; and as θεός comes in as the subject of discourse, in the sequel, (at least in v. 13), I see no place so apposite for its introduction, as at καὶ κριτικός. Indeed, there can be no other, for unless it comes in here, we must carry λόγος θεοῦ, as the subject, through the whole paragraph; which does not seem to me to be the design of the writer.

God is here represented as one, who scans the whole of man's internal character, and sits in judgment upon it. Consequently, as the writer intimates, no secret act or purposes of unbelief, or defection from the Christian cause, will remain unnoticed or unpunished. Ἐνθύμησις and ἔννοια are nearly allied in meaning. They are both employed here, merely for the purpose of designating *universality*, i. e. the whole of men's internal thoughts and purposes.

13. *Καὶ οὐκ ἔστι αὐτοῦ, yea, nothing is concealed from the view of him* [i. e. of God]. *Κτίσις* means, *any created thing*; literally *act of creation*, but it follows the Hebrew בְּרִיאָה. *Οὐ κτίσις* means, *no thing*, לֹא כֹל=οὐδέν, or לֹא בְרִיאָה.

Πάντα τετραχηλισμένα, but all things are naked and exposed to the view of him, to whom we are accountable. Τραχηλίζω is best explained here, in the sense which the Greek classical writers attach to it. It means, (1) To lay bare and bend back the neck, so as to expose the throat, in order to its being cut open or dissevered. Hence, (2) *To expose, to lay open*; which is the idea of the word in the phrase before us; as it is given in the translation above. Ὀφθαλμοῖς, *eyes*, i. e. *sight, view, cognisance*; for it is often used in this way.

Πρὸς ὃν ἡμῖν ὁ λόγος, lit. *with whom*, [before whom, in whose power, or at whose disposal], *is our account*. The sense of *account* λόγος often has. The common way of rendering λόγος here, is, *concern, dealing, business*. This sense the word will bear; but it is less in conformity to the *usus loquendi*, and less apposite to the design of the writer. Chrysostom understands it as I have translated it. And so the preceding clause requires it to be rendered; for this speaks of God, (or λόγος, if you please) as κριτικός, i. e. *aptus ad judicandum*; the clause, now under consideration, represents men as actually accountable to him, who is the omniscient judge.

The writer now proceeds to the consideration of a subject, at which he had merely hinted in chap. 3: 1; where he calls Christ the ἀρχιερέα of the Christian religion. As ἀπόστολος (שַׁלִּיחַ דַּאֲבוּהִי), *praefectus domo Dei*, he had already compared him with Moses, 3. 2—6; and then built upon the result of this comparison, the very solemn and affectionate warning against unbelief which follows, 3: 7—19. For the encouragement of the Hebrew Christians, he had also taken occasion, (after having spoken of *unbelievers* as excluded from the *rest* of God), to represent the promises still held out to *believers* of enjoying that rest. Such was the case, under the ancient dispensation, and such he argues, is still the case: "there remains a σαββατισμὸς for the people of God." He then, as we have seen, concludes the subject, as usual, with an exhortation; in which he calls on them not to fail of this rest, 4: 11, nor to incur the awful penalty attached to unbelief, 4: 11—13.

Having thus completed the comparison of Christ as ἀπόστολος with Moses, and drawn from the result of it those practical deductions at which our epistle every where aims; the writer now proceeds to compare Christ, as ἀρχιερεύς, with the Levitical order of priesthood; which comparison, with its various subordinate parts, and the occasional warnings and comminations that now and then are intermixed, extends to chap. 10: 18; which is the end of what may be called the *doctrinal* part of our epistle.

The mind of the writer plainly appears to have been more intensely engaged, with comparing Christ's priesthood to that of Aaron and the Levites, than with any other subject in his epistle. The comparison, for example, of Christ with the angels, in chap. I., is short; the comparison of him with Moses, in chap. III., still shorter. But the comparison of the Aaronical priesthood, as to dignity, duties, offices, and utility, with that of Christ, and of their functions with his, makes up, in fact, the body of our epistle. It is natural to inquire, why this should be so; and the obvious answer, seems to be, 'Because the writer regarded this part of the Saviour's office and work, as being, in a comparative sense, by far the most important. As a *priest*, he made atonement for sin, by the sacrifice of himself; in regard to which, no angel, no prophet, no teacher, no Aaronical priest, could bear a comparison with him. The most prominent part of all his character, as a Saviour of sinners, is, that he is "the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sins of the world."

Nothing could be more inappropriate, than the division of chapters made, in some cases, in our epistle. Chap. III. most plainly ought to be united with Chap. 4: 1—13; thus comprising all that properly belongs to one and the same subject. Chap. IV. ought to begin at 4: 14, and to terminate with the end of chap. V., where there is a transition from doctrine to exhortation.

In regard to the course and method of argument, pursued through this leading portion of our epistle, (viz. from 4: 14 to 10: 18), in which a comparison between the Aaronical priesthood and that of Christ is made, and where all that is connected with the office, and person, and duty of priests is also drawn into the comparison; I have been able to find no satisfactory elucidation of it, in any commentator or critic whom I have perused. After attentive study of this whole passage, often repeated, it seems to me that the method of the writer is capable of being intelligibly stated; and I shall now venture upon the experiment.

The apostle introduces the topic, (to which he had adverted in 3: 1, by calling Christ the ἀρχιερέα τῆς ὁμολογίας ἡμῶν), by calling Jesus ἀρχιερέα μέγαν, and exhorting the Hebrews to hold fast the profession (ὁμολογίας) which they had made, 4: 14. He again hints, very briefly, an encouragement to persevere, although subjected to trials and afflictions, because of the sympathy that the Saviour would feel for them, as having possessed a nature like theirs exposed to trial and suffering, 4: 15, 16. But as he had already dwelt at large on this topic (2: 6—18), he merely adverts to it here, and passes on to suggest the points of comparison between the Levitical priesthood and that of Christ.

(1.) Every priest is appointed in behalf of men, in order that he may superintend and direct the concerns which men have with God, and may present their oblations and sacrifices before him, 5: 1.

(2.) Every priest, being himself "compassed with infirmity," is prepared by his own experience to sympathize with others in like condition; and because of his own sins and imperfections, it becomes his duty to offer expiatory sacrifices for himself as well as for them, 5. 2, 3.

(3.) No priest appoints himself to the sacred office; his appointment is by divine direction, 5: 4.

In making a comparison of Christ, as high priest, with the Aaronical priests, in regard to the points here stated, the apostle inverts the order in which they are brought forward, and shews

(1.) That Christ was constituted high priest by divine appointment. This he proves, in vs. 5, 6, by quotations from the second Psalm, and also from Ps. 110: 4.

(2.) He then passes to the *second* topic of comparison, viz, the infirmity of the nature which Christ our great high priest possessed, and which qualified him, in a peculiar manner, to sympathize with the infirmities of his people. He represents Christ as having, during his incarnate state, uttered vehement supplications on account of his trials and distresses, and as experiencing, like other men, deliverance from them, 5: 7. Even though he was clothed with the dignity of the Son of God, he acquired a practical knowledge of what it is to obey in the midst of sufferings, 5: 8. Thus was he fitted μετριοπαθῆσαι τοῖς ἀγνοοῦσι; and having thus obeyed and suffered, in consequence thereof he was exalted to glory (τελειωθείς), where, as *kingly* high priest, after the order of Melchisedek, he is an all-sufficient Saviour to those who believe and obey him, 5: 9. 10.

As one of the proofs that Christ was exalted to be an all-sufficient Saviour, the writer has again, v. 10, produced the passage, which asserts him to be a priest forever after the order of Melchisedek, i. e. a kingly priest whose office is not of limited extent or temporary duration. But having thus introduced a topic attended with difficulty, and demanding an enlightened knowledge of the Scriptures and of the nature of Christianity in order to be rightly and fully comprehended, the apostle stops short in the prosecution of his subject, in order to admonish those whom he was addressing, with regard to the little progress which they had made, in such knowledge as would render them adequate fully to comprehend the discussion concerning the topic in question, in which he was about to engage. His reproof for their comparative ignorance, he pursues through 5: 11—14. In 6: 1—8, he warns them against the awful danger, which would result from stopping short or turning back in their course, in order that he might thus excite them to more diligence and exertion respecting religious improvement. Notwithstanding the seeming severity of his remarks in regard to this topic, he assures them that he has an affectionate confidence in their good estate, 6: 9; and this, because God will have regard to the benevolent character which they had before exhibited, 6: 10. He then exhorts them to press forward in their Christian course, 6: 11; and assures them, that the promise and oath of God are pledged, that believers who persevere shall attain to salvation, 6: 13—19.

After this digression, (if that may be called digression which is so directly concerned with the main object of the writer), he proceeds to descant upon the topic of Christ's priesthood, as instituted by God and compared with that of Melchisedek, which had been brought to view by the text of Scripture cited, in 5: 6, 10.

In order to do this so as to make a strong impression, he begins by giving an account of the dignity of Melchisedek. He was king of Salem, and priest of the most high God; his superiority was acknowledged by Abraham, when he paid him a tithe of the spoils which he had taken, 7: 1, 2. The same Melchisedek was not descended from priests, (and therefore his office did not fall to him by the mere right of succession, but was the special appointment of God); he has no genealogy assigned him in the sacred writings, nor any limited term mentioned in which his priesthood began or expired; like Christ's priesthood, his is unlimited, 7: 3. Abraham himself, exalted as this patriarch was, acknowledged the superiority of Melchisedek; and the Levitical priests descended from him did as it were acknowledge the same, by their progenitor who paid this homage, and to whom they must be counted inferior, 7: 4—7. Besides, the Levitical priests, who receive tithes, hold their office only for a limited duration; while Melchisedek is a priest for an unlimited time, 7: 8. Indeed, (if one may venture so to express himself), the Levites themselves paid tithes to Melchisedek, through Abraham their progenitor, 7: 9, 10.

Thus much for the superiority of Melchisedek over the Levitical priests. The conclusion, in this case, is left to be supplied by the reader's mind, after the manner in which Paul often writes. The reasoning is thus. 'Christ is a priest after the order of Melchisedek; Melchisedek is superior to the Aaronical priests; consequently, Christ as a priest is superior to them.'

The writer next proceeds to another topic of great importance, and which very naturally connected itself with the consideration of Christ's priesthood, as compared with that of Melchisedek. If, says he, the Levitical priesthood was adequate for all the purposes of atonement, and for the purification of the consciences of sinners, then what necessity that the appointment of another priest should be made, as is predicted in Ps. 110: 4 : 7 : 11. Now another order of priesthood necessarily demands a change of former institutions, 7: 12; and that another order is necessary, follows from the fact, that Christ (the priest after the new order) was to spring from the tribe of Judah, 7: 13. Still more evident must it be, that the order would be different, because the new priestly office is to be *perpetual*, 7: 15—17. Consequently, the old order of things gives place to a new and better one, 7: 18, 19.

Besides, the new priest is appointed by the solemnity of an oath, while the Aaronical priests were not, 7: 21; consequently, we must suppose the new order of things to be superior, 7: 22. This superiority appears specially in the fact, that the priesthood of Christ is perpetual, while that of the Levites was constantly changing by succession, 7: 23, 24. Christ therefore is an adequate and *never-failing* helper, to all who come unto God through him, 7: 25.

It is thus, that the apostle illustrates, enlarges, and confirms his views respecting the subject introduced in 5: 6, 10, by a quotation from Ps. 110: 4, respecting the priesthood of Christ. The amount of the argument is, that by the oath of God Christ was appointed to his priesthood, while the Aaronical priests were appointed without such a solemnity; that the priesthood itself, being of the order of Melchisedek, i. e. not by descent, not limited, not temporary, and of higher dignity than that of Aaron, Christ must be regarded as altogether superior to the order of Jewish priests. The inference of course is, that the Hebrews ought not to forsake him who was a superior priest, in order to attach themselves to those who were inferior ones.

Having thus completed what he had to say, respecting the comparison of Christ and Melchisedek as priests, (all of which is employed to the advantage of the cause which he is advocating); the writer resumes the topic which he had begun in 5: 7, 8, viz. that of Christ's sympathy with those "who are compassed with infirmity." He had already suggested there, that Christ possessed all the common sympathies and innocent infirmities of our nature, in common with other priests. But not to leave it uncertain, whether in *all* respects Jesus was "compassed with such infirmities" as the Jewish priests, he now proceeds to point out one important difference, viz. that the high priest of the new dispensation is altogether superior to the priests of the old, in regard to the moral purity and perfection of his character. He is holy, and altogether sinless, 7: 26; and therefore needs not, like them, to offer any sacrifice on his own account, 7: 27; for he has no such infirmity as renders this at all necessary, since he is priest in a state of perfection and glorious exaltation, 7: 28.

Having thus shewn the superiority of Christ over the Levitical priests, in respect to the second particular, viz. *the qualifications for sympathizing with erring men*, the writer next proceeds to the most important topic of all, viz, *the office of Christ, as a priest, in directing the concerns of men with God, and in presenting a propitiatory sacrifice for them.*

He begins by averring, that the principal thing (κεφάλαιον), in respect to the matters which he is discussing, is the priesthood of Christ in the heavenly sanctuary, 8: 1, 2. He then re-introduces the topic, which he had before stated in 5: 1. Taking for granted the truth of the sentiment there stated, he now draws the inference from it, that Christ (being a priest) must also have an offering to present, 8: 1—3. But if Christ were on earth he could not be a priest; for priests, whose office it is to perform duty in the *earthly* sanctuary, are already constituted by divine appointment, 8: 4; and these perform their office in a temple that is merely a copy or resemblance of the heavenly one, 8: 5. Christ's ministry is as much superior to theirs, as the new covenant is to the old one, 8: 6; and the Scripture itself predicts, that the old covenant should be abolished, and the new one introduced in its stead, 8: 7—13. Of course the new covenant must be superior; and Christ, who ministers in the heavenly temple, must be superior to those who serve merely in the earthly one.

Next, the writer proceeds to consider the manner and design of the sacerdotal service, and the ends which could be accomplished by it.

The earthly temple consisted of various apartments, and contained a variety of utensils, 9: 1—5. The priests performed daily service in the outer temple, 9: 6; while the high priest

entered the inner one, (where God dwelt), only *once* in each year, when he presented the blood of the great atoning sacrifice, 9: 7. A permission to enter only so seldom into the inner sanctuary, shewed that free access to God at all times and places was not yet disclosed, while the first dispensation lasted, 9: 8. Indeed, these rites, with all their appurtenances, were merely a symbol of what was to be effected under the gospel, 9: 9, 10.

Christ, on the other hand, the heavenly high priest, entered the eternal sanctuary with his own blood, procuring everlasting redemption for sinners, 9: 11, 12. The blood of bulls and goats, presented by the Jewish high priest, effected nothing more than ceremonial, external purification, 9: 13; while the blood of Christ purifies the conscience and renders the worshipper truly acceptable to God, 9: 14.

Such is the efficacy of the propitiatory sacrifice made by the death of Christ, that it extends back to the sins of former ages; so that all, who are called of God to partake of the blessings of the gospel, attain, through his *death*, to a heavenly *inheritance*, 9: 15.

The mention of Christ's *death* here, in connexion with the assurance effected by it of a heavenly *inheritance* for believers, affords occasion to the writer to compare the new διαθήκη ratified by the death of Christ, with the διαθῆναι which are ratified by the death of testators. The Greek word διαθήκη not only answers to בְּרִית, but also means such an arrangement as is made by a man's *last will* or *testament*, and is employed, not unfrequently, in this latter sense. Hence our author, after asserting (9: 15) that Christ's *death* made sure an *inheritance* to believers, falls very naturally upon comparing the διαθήκη thus ratified by the death of Jesus, with the διαθῆναι ratified by the death of their respective testators. Such, says he, is the custom among men in regard to *testaments*, that the death of the testators must supervene, in order to give them full effect and confirmation, 9: 16, 17. Even the first διαθήκη (בְּרִית), although it could not be so appropriately called a *testament*, was sanctioned in a manner not unlike that in which the new διαθήκη is sanctioned; for *blood*, (the emblem of death), was applied to almost every thing which pertained to the ancient covenant or διαθήκη, in order either to ratify or to consecrate it, 9: 18—22. Now, since this was so extensively done, in regard to things here, which are mere resemblances or types of heavenly things, these heavenly things themselves, being of a nature so much more exalted, must be consecrated by a corresponding sacrifice, of a higher nature than any offered in the earthly temple, 9: 23. For it is in the heavenly temple, that Christ discharges the functions of his priestly office, 9: 24; yet not, like the Jewish priests, repeating expiatory offerings frequently, but once for all performing this sacred rite, 9: 25, 26. As men die but once, and Christ, in his human nature and by dying in it, made an expiatory offering; so he could make this but once; therefore, when he shall make his second appearance, it will not be to repeat his sin-offering, but for the deliverance of all who wait for his coming, 9: 27, 28.

Having thus compared various particulars, which have respect to the priesthood of the descendants of Aaron, to those which relate to the priesthood of Jesus; the writer comes, last of all, to treat more fully of the inefficacy of the Jewish sacrifices, and of the perfect and everlasting efficacy of that propitiatory offering, which was made by the high priest of the heavenly sanctuary. He had, indeed, already hinted at this, several times, in the preceding parts of his epistle, e. g. 7: 11, 19. 8: 7, 13. 9: 8—10. 9: 13, 14; but as it was the most important topic of all, and the most difficult to be urged on the minds of Jews, he reserved it until the last, in order that he might give it a more ample discussion.

He begins by declaring, that the rites of the law were designed to be *typical*, and that the yearly sacrifices which were offered under it, never could quiet and purify the consciences of men, 10: 1; otherwise, the offerings need not have been continually repeated, 10: 2. The remembrance of sin is constantly renewed by them, 10: 3. Indeed, it is plainly impossible that the blood of bulls and goats should take away sin, i. e. remove the penalty of it, or lessen its power, 10: 4. In accordance with this sentiment, the Scripture (Ps. XL.) represents the Saviour, when entering upon his work, as saying, that sacrifices and offerings are of no value in the sight of God, 10: 5, 6. The Messiah represents himself as doing what God requires, viz. what God requires in order that he may exercise his clemency, 10: 7. Of course, (so our author reasons), sacrifices and offerings are rejected, in respect to making real propitiation, while the "obedience of Christ unto death" is accepted instead of them, 10: 8, 9. This sacrifice is truly efficacious for moral purposes, 10: 10. The Jewish priests repeated continually their sac-

rifices; but the offering of Christ, *once* made, is of everlasting efficacy, 10: 11, 12. Having once made this, he may expect the cause on account of which it was made to be victorious, 10: 13; for *one* offering, *once* made by Jesus, is all sufficient; its effects are never to cease, 10: 14. To such an efficacy of Christ's offering, the Holy Spirit has testified in the Scriptures, by declaring, that under the *new* covenant sin should be forgiven, and iniquity no more remembered, 10: 15, 16. Consequently, offering for sin needs not to be repeated, after pardon is actually obtained, 10: 17, 18.

With this consideration, the author closes the comparison of Jesus, as a priest, with the Jewish priests under the Levitical dispensation. This comparison in all its parts, however, occupies the greater portion of his epistle, viz. from 4: 14 to 10: 18. He then proceeds to exhortations, warnings, and various arguments drawn from different sources, in order to urge upon his Hebrew brethren the importance of persevering in the Christian faith.

The writer of our epistle has sometimes been charged with being discursive, and with having very little connexion in the series of his reasoning. If the charge of *discursiveness* means, that he often stops short in his course of argument, in order to warn those whom he was addressing against danger, and to expostulate with them, this is certainly true, in a remarkable degree. But this is the ultimate and highest end, which the writer himself had in view. If he has practised digression, it is digression exceedingly to his purpose, and altogether consonant with the unconstrained nature of epistolary address.

In respect to an alleged want of connexion in the author's reasoning, the analysis already presented is the best answer which I can give to this charge. The method of reasoning seems, indeed, to have been too commonly overlooked, or to have been only partially discerned, in the commentaries to which I have had access; but I cannot help thinking that there is a connexion, which can be clearly and satisfactorily traced, throughout the whole. If I have succeeded in attempting to trace it, then the student will be aided in forming his views, with respect to the relation that one part of our epistle bears to another, in that portion of it which has now been analysed.

If the question be asked, why the apostle should resort to comparisons of this nature, in order to illustrate the office of Christ, or rather, the virtue and efficacy of his mediation and redemption; the answer plainly is, 'A regard to the condition and feelings of those whom he addressed, led him to do so.' The Jews of that day, regarded the office of high priest as the most honorable of all offices then sustained. The authority and dignity of this office were very great, in earlier times, under the Jewish kings. But after the captivity, the offices of king and high-priest were frequently united in the same person. This of course would tend to elevate the esteem, in which the Jews held the rank of high priest. When the Romans reduced Judea to a tributary province, the *civil* power was transferred to the Procurator sent there by them; but the supreme *ecclesiastical* power still remained in the hands of the high-priest, who was supreme judge of the land, and president of the Sanhedrim. The high priest was, moreover, the only person who could enter the most holy place, on the great day of national expiation, and make atonement for the people. On all these accounts, the Jews cherished the greatest degree of reverence for this office. They looked upon it as their glory, and expected from the functions of it, pardon for sin and acceptance with God. How difficult it was to wean them from these views, even those of them who had embraced Christianity, the Acts of the Apostles, and almost all the apostolic Epistles, abundantly testify. But this must necessarily be done, however difficult, if Christianity was to be fully admitted and practised by them.

There can be no doubt, that the unbelieving Jews would urge with all their power, upon the new converts to Christianity, the views and feelings which the latter had once possessed in common with them, with regard to this subject. It entered into the very essence of Judaism, that such views and feelings should be cherished; and this was a trait which distinguished the Jews in a peculiar manner from other nations. The apostle, in addressing the Hebrew Christians, had to contend with such arguments as the adversaries of Christianity among the Jews would bring, in order to shake the constancy of the new converts. The splendour and the supposed importance of the Jewish high-priesthood, however, was, after all, a thing which Jewish Christians must be brought to renounce. How could they, educated as they had been, do this? To satisfy their minds on this subject, the apostle presents a comparison of this office in all its various respects, with the office of high priest as sustained by Christ; and he

shews that instead of giving up any thing, by embracing the new religion, they would only exchange a high priest who was imperfect, who offered sacrifices that effected a purification only external and of mere temporary efficacy, who officiated in a temple made with hands—all the mere type or symbol of something that was of a spiritual and more exalted nature—all this they would exchange, by embracing and adhering to the Christian religion, for a high priest without sin, whose sacrifice "purged the conscience from dead works," and had an "everlasting efficacy;" which was offered too in a temple not made with hands, of which the Jewish temple with all its splendour and solemn pomp was only a mere image. Could any thing, now, be better adapted to fortify the minds of those to whom he wrote in their Christian profession, and to wean them from their old prejudices? And is it not allowable, that an apostle should reason in a manner best adapted to the condition and feelings of those whom he addresses?

I am aware that much has been said, by recent commentators, on arguing κατ' ἄνθρωπον, or in a way of *accommodation*, in our epistle; and that all the comparisons made in it, between things and persons, under the law and under the gospel, have been ranked with this class of reasoning or argument. For those, who do not acknowledge the divine origin of the Jewish religion, nor that any of its rites, sacrifices, or persons were symbolical of any thing belonging to Christianity, such a mode of explanation may be necessary. But for those who believe, with the writer of our epistle, that the Jewish religion was of God, and that the ancient Scriptures have revealed a Messiah, very little, if any, of arguing merely in the way of accommodation, in our epistle, needs to be admitted. Does not the 110th Psalm call Christ a *high priest*? And did not the Jews of Paul's day admit, (as well as Paul himself), that this Psalm had respect to the Messiah? Undoubtedly they did. Where then is the *accommodation* of the writer to the mere prejudices of those whom he addressed, when it is evident that both he and they entertained an opinion in common with regard to the exegesis of the 110th Psalm? Of course, both admitted that Christ was to be a high priest. But how? Why? Not of the ordinary kind; for he did not descend from Aaron. Not to make expiation which should merely pertain to external purification; but to make an expiation which should purge "the conscience from dead works," and which should procure the pardon of sin with God, and "bring in everlasting redemption for his people."

It is not, then, merely to satisfy the Jew that he need relinquish nothing of his regard for the excellence and importance of the office of high priest by embracing Christianity, and that he has exchanged a less splendid office of priest under Judaism, for a more splendid one under Christianity, that Paul dwells so long on the virtues and dignity of Christ's office as high priest. No doubt he had this object in his eye, as I have already stated, when he entered upon the consideration of this topic. But why does he dwell on it so much longer, than he does on the comparison of Christ with Moses? Not because the Jews exalted the high priest above Moses; for this surely they did not. It was because Christ, in the office of high priest, performed that peculiar duty, which of all others made him what he was, the SAVIOUR of *sinners*, *the* REDEEMER *of lost men*; because, as *priest*, he offered an *expiatory sacrifice*, which takes away the sins of the world, and makes him the propitiation for their offences. I am entirely unable to explain the copiousness of our epistle on this point, if this be not the reason of it. And if this be admitted, then there is reason enough, why the apostle should dwell so long upon it.

I know of no part of the Scriptures, which explains the nature and object of the Jewish ritual, in a manner so spiritual, so satisfactory, so clear, so worthily of God, and so profitably to us, as chaps. V—X of the epistle to the Hebrews. As a key to the Old Testament, these chapters deserve the most attentive and thorough study of all who wish to understand the Bible. As a statement and vindication of the great work of Christ, and the atonement which he made by his blood for sin, they stand in the very first rank of all the Scriptural writings. As adapted to the wants and condition of those whom the apostle addressed, they are a consummate specimen of skilful argument, and of powerful persuasion and remonstrance.

14. *Ἔχοντες οὖν ἀρχιερέα μέγαν, moreover, since we have a great high priest.* So the words, literally construed, seem to mean. But it is doubtful whether this translation conveys the exact shade of meaning, which should be attached to the original. In the apostle's day, *ἀρχιερεύς* no longer designated merely one man, the single head of the whole priesthood, but it was applied also to his deputy (סְגָן); to those who had quitted the office of the high priesthood (exauctorati); and also to the priests, at the head of each of the twenty four classes of the priesthood. The word *ἀρχιερεύς* of itself, then, without any adjunct, did not, in the time of Paul, designate the *high priest* by way of eminence, who was the only person that could enter the most holy place, and make atonement for sin. Hence the apostle says, not simply *ἀρχιερεύς*, but *ἀρχιερεὺς μέγας;* which designates a specific individual. This corresponds exactly to the idea conveyed by the Hebrew כֹּהֵן גָּדוֹל, which was applied only to him who was actually *Pontifex Maximus.*

Διεληλυθότα τοὺς οὐρανούς, passed through the heavens. Wahl and others, *passed into the heavens;* interpreting *διεληλυθότα* as equivalent to *εἰσερχόμενον, entered into.* But they seem to me plainly to have mistaken the force of the writer's expression here. According to the Hebrew idiom, God dwells above the visible firmament, שָׁמַיִם, *οὐρανοί. Through* this Jesus passed, when he ascended to take his "seat at the right hand of the majesty on high, 1: 3." There is a plain allusion, too, to the high priest of the Jews, who, once in a year, went into the most holy place, *passing through* the vail, which screened the residence of divine majesty from the view of men, 9: 7, 8. So, our great high priest has passed through the heavens, into the immediate presence of God, into the "holy of holies" in the upper world. This explanation, which Bengel and Owen defend, I must think to be the right one; although Ernesti ventures to call it *stulta animadversio.*

Ἰησοῦν τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ θεοῦ is added, to shew whom he means by *ἀρχιερέα. Κρατῶμεν τῆς ὁμολογίας, let us firmly hold* [tenaciously adhere to] *the religion which we have professed,* viz. Christianity. *Κρατέω* takes either the accusative or genitive after it.

To encourage them to follow this advice, the writer sets before them the assistance which they may expect, in their efforts so to do.

15. *Οὐ γὰρ ἀσθενείαις ἡμῶν, for we have not a high*

priest, who is incapable of sympathizing with our weaknesses. The form of the expression is negative; a mode of expression frequently employed by the sacred writers. When the negative form is thus employed, it is of the same meaning as an affirmative assertion would be, i. e. it is the same in this case, as if the author had said "We have a high priest, who will sympathize with our weaknesses." So, "John confessed, and denied not, but confessed, etc. John 1: 20." In most cases, however, there is some *intensity* of coloring designed to be given, when this negative form of expression is chosen, in preference to simple affirmation.

Πεπειρασμένον, see on 2: 18. *Κατὰ πάντα, in all respects;* not to be metaphysically or mathematically taken. The meaning is, that he, like us, was subjected to trial by suffering on account of the truth; he, like us, was solicited to sin, e. g. when Satan tempted him, and often when the Scribes and Pharisees tempted him.

Καθ' ὁμοιότητα, scil. *ἡμῶν*, i. e. *who was tempted like us; παραπλησίως ἡμῶν*, says Theophylact; *ὁμοίως ἡμῖν*, Origen. This surely does not imply, that temptations had, in all respects, the same influence upon him as upon us; but only, that he was exposed to be attacked by them, in like manner as we are. He possessed a nature truly human, 2: 14, 17; he was therefore susceptible of being excited by the power of temptations, although he never yielded to them. So the writer;

Χωρὶς ἁμαρτίας, without sin; i. e. although assailed by temptations of every kind, he never yielded, in any case, to their influence. He remained sinless. But why is this here asserted? Principally, I apprehend, to guard against any mistake, in respect to what the writer had just said. To shew the Hebrews, that they might depend on the sympathy and compassion of their high priest (comp. 2: 17, 18) to help them, in all the trials and difficulties to which an unshaken adherence to Christianity would subject them, he declares that Jesus was himself subject to the like trials, in all respects. But when he had so said, as if fearing they might draw the conclusion, that in some cases, at least, he was (like others) overcome by them, the author immediately adds, *χωρὶς ἁμαρτίας*. It may be, that the expression implies an exhortation thus, viz, 'Jesus when tried did not sin; Christian brethren, follow his example.' I prefer, however, the former explanation.

16. *Let us, then, approach the throne of grace μετὰ παῤῥησίας, with freedom of speech;* i. e. since we have such a sympathizing, compassionate high priest, to offer our supplications to God and to help us, let us go to God with confidence that we shall receive the aid that we need. "Ask and ye shall receive." *Τῷ θρόνῳ τῆς χάριτος* has reference to *the mercy seat*, in the temple, on which God is represented as sitting enthroned. There he heard the supplications of his people, presented by the high priest; there he accepted their oblations; and from thence he dispensed to them the blessings which they needed. Christians may now approach the mercy seat in heaven, by their high priest, and may come *μετὰ παῤῥησίας, with confidence.*

Ἵνα λάβωμεν ἔλεον, that we may obtain mercy, i. e. that compassion may be exercised towards Christians, in their afflictions and trials. *Καὶ χάριν εὕρωμεν βοήθειαν, and find favour in respect to timely assistance. Χάριν* does not differ much, here, from *ἔλεον*, except that it is a word of a more generic nature. The sentiment is, *be helped opportunely;* i. e. now, when we are persecuted and sorely pressed by trials, we may obtain that aid which such seasons require. This is exactly the idea conveyed by *εὔκαιρον βοήθειαν, auxilium opportunum.* Literally the Greek runs thus, *And find grace, with respect to opportune assistance.*

CHAP. V.

1. *Ἐξ ἀνθρώπων λαμβανόμενος, selected, taken from men.* So *λαβεῖν*, in Acts 15: 14. In a similar sense, לָקַח is often used in Hebrew; and *λαμβάνω*, not unfrequently, in the classics. The meaning is, that priests, appointed according to the usages of the Levitical law, are appointed to have the oversight of the religious concerns of the people, specially to make their oblations and sacrifices.

Ὑπὲρ ἀνθρώπων καθίσταται τὰ πρὸς τὸν θεόν, is constituted for the benefit of men, in relation to their concerns with God. Καθίσταται is often employed to designate an appointment to office of any kind; e. g. Matt. 24: 45. Luke 12: 14. et al. So, also, it is used by heathen writers. *Ὑπέρ, for the benefit of, for the sake of, on account of;* a frequent use of the word. *Τὰ πρὸς τὸν*

θεόν, for *κατὰ τὰ κ. τ. λ*, there being an ellipsis of the preposition, which is very common in such cases. The idea is, 'In respect to their religious concerns; in regard to business which they have to transact with God;' particularly,

Ἵνα προσφέρῃ ἁμαρτιῶν, that he may offer [to God] *both oblations and sacrifices for sin. Δῶρα* I take here to mean, the various kinds of *thank-offerings* etc., that were to be presented to God, agreeably to the ritual established by Moses; and *θυσίας*, the various *sin* and *trespass-offerings*, that were made with slain beasts. To the act of *slaying θυσίας* refers, as it is derived from *θύω to kill*. In all these, and the like concerns, the high priest was to act the part of an *internuntius*, a mediator, between God and men; i. e. he was to aid men in regard to their spiritual or religious concerns. It should be remarked, however, that *δῶρα* sometimes includes the idea of sacrifices, e. g. 8: 4, comp. 8: 3. Yet where both *δῶρα* and *θυσία* are employed, they are not to be regarded as synonymes. Both are employed to designate the *universality* of the idea intended, i. e. (in this case) offerings of every kind.

2. *Μετριοπαθεῖν δυνάμενος, one who can exercise gentleness* or *moderation*. This classic or philosophic use of the word *μετριοπαθεῖν* may be briefly explained. The Stoics maintained that a man should be *ἀπαθής*, i. e. not subject to passions, such as anger, fear, hope, joy etc. The Platonists, on the other hand, averred, that *a wise man* should be *μετριοπαθής, moderate in his affections*, and not *ἀπαθής*. The leading sense, then, of the word *μετριοπαθεῖν* is, *to be moderate in our feelings or passions*. In our text, the connexion shews us, that this moderation or gentleness was to be exercised by the high priest *τοῖς ἀγνοοῦσι καὶ πλανωμένοις, toward those who were ignorant and erring*. In other words, he was to be lenient towards offenders, to treat them with gentleness and moderation, with kindness and not with severity. The comparison of Christ as a priest, in respect to this point, is presented in 5: 7—9 and 7: 26—28.

Ἀγνοοῦσι καὶ πλανωμένοις some have construed as a Hendiadys, and rendered the phrase thus; *those who ignorantly offend*, or, *who offend through ignorance*. But surely the indulgence of the high priest on earth was not limited merely to this class of offenders, much less is the clemency of our great high priest in the

heavens so limited. Ἀγνοέω is repeatedly used by the Seventy, as a translation of the Hebrew שָׁגָה, שָׁגַג, אָשַׁם, which signify, *to err, to commit sin, to render one's self guilty*. So Sirac. 5: 18, *in a great or little thing μὴ ἀγνόει, sin not*. So Polyb. V. 11. 5, πολεμεῖν τοῖς ἀγνοήσασι, *to make war on those who have been faulty*. But if any should think it preferable, in our verse, to retain the common sense of *ignorance*, then plainly it must be construed of voluntary criminal ignorance; and in such a case, πλανωμένοις designates those who commit offences in consequence of such ignorance. But I prefer the other rendering, which makes ἀγνοοῦσι καὶ πλανωμένοις to be an accumulation of descriptive words, in order to designate offenders of various kinds. This comports better too with *fact*, either in relation to the office of the Levitical priest in the earthly sanctuary, or to that of Jesus in the heavenly one.

Ἐπεὶ καὶ ἀσθένειαν, *since he himself is compassed with infirmity*, i. e. he is himself an offender, or, he is exposed by his weaknesses to commit the like sins with those, whose offerings he is called to present to God. Περίκειται, in the passive, is construed with an accusative after it. Ἀσθένεια means here, *moral infirmity* or *weakness*; not natural frailty of the *physical* system. The meaning is, that the high priest, "haud ignarus mali, miseris succurrere discit."

3. Καὶ διὰ ταύτην . . . ἁμαρτιῶν, *and on this account*, [viz. because he is himself a sinner], *he must present sin offerings, as well for himself as for the people*. Προσφερεῖν, i. e. πρόσοφορὰν vel θυσίαν, Hebrew הַקְרָבָה עוֹלָה. Προσφέρω is the common word employed to denote the presentation of an offering, gift, or sacrifice to God, and corresponds to the Hebrew עָלָה, or rather הַעֲלָה in Hiphil. See the superiority of Christ represented, in respect to the point here suggested, in 7: 26—28.

4. Καὶ οὐχ ἑαυτῷ Ἀαρών, *moreover, no one can assume the honour* [of the high priesthood] *to himself, but he is appointed by God, even as Aaron was*. Καλούμενος, i. e. δεῖ καλούμενος εἶναι.

5. Οὕτω καὶ ἀρχιερέα, *accordingly, Christ did not claim for himself the honour of being high priest*, or, Christ *did not exalt himself to the honour of being high priest*. Δοξάζειν, *to exalt, to claim honour for*, John 8: 54. Rom. 11: 13.

Ἀλλ' ὁ λαλήσας γεγέννηκά σε, *but he who said to him, Thou art my son, this day have I begotten thee*, [ἐδόξασεν αὐτόν,

exalted him.] So the ellipsis must be supplied. The meaning is, exalted him to the office of high priest; i. e. the *Father* bestowed this honour upon the Son, see on 1: 5; or in other words, he was *divinely appointed.*

6. *Καθὼς καὶ ἐν ἑτέρῳ λέγει, so, also, he declares in another passage* [of Scripture]. The declaration is, that the *Father* constituted the Son a priest; for the writer had affirmed, in v. 4, that a priest must be divinely constituted. The quotation is from Ps. 110: 4; a Psalm which, as I have before remarked, not only the apostle and most Christian commentators, but even the Jewish Rabbies in general agree, has relation to the Messiah.

Σὺ ἱερεὺς Μελχισεδέκ, thou art a priest forever, after the order of Melchisedek. Ἱερεύς designates here a priest *generically* considered. The Psalmist, and after him the apostle, does not say, ἀρχιερεύς, because the sequel shews that the personage referred to must be of the highest order of priests, viz. of the same order with that of Melchisedek.

Κατὰ τὴν τάξιν, Hebrew עַל דִּבְרָתִי, i. e. עַל דִּבְרַת, for י is paragogic here. This Hebrew phrase commonly means, *on account of, for the sake of;* but such a meaning would be wholly inapposite in Ps. 110: 4. The sense of it, as there employed, plainly is similar to that of דָּבָר in Deut. 15: 9. 19: 4. 1 K. 9: 15, viz, *manner, order, arrangement, kind.* So the classic sense of τάξις is, *order, arrangement, place, office, rank.* The simple meaning is, 'Thou art a priest, of an order or rank like that of Melchisedek.'

When in v. 10, the writer repeats the quotation here made, he uses ἀρχιερεύς, instead of ἱερεύς the word employed in his first quotation. The object of the quotation in v. 6, is simply to prove, that the office of high priest was conferred on Christ by divine appointment, comp. vs. 4 and 6. The particulars of the comparison, in respect to the priesthood of Christ and Melchisedek, are not immediately brought into view, but suspended until the writer has introduced other considerations relative to Christ as a priest, 5: 7—9, and given vent to his feelings of concern for those whom he was addressing, by suggesting various considerations, adapted to reprove, 5: 11—14, to warn, 6: 1—9, as well as to excite and animate them, 6: 10—20.

In regard to *κατὰ τὸν αἰῶνα,* it is to be taken in a qualified sense here, as often elsewhere, e. g. comp. Luke 1: 33 with 1 Cor.

15: 24—28. The priesthood of Christ will doubtless continue no longer than his mediatorial reign; for when his reign as mediator ceases, his whole work both as mediator and as priest will have been accomplished.

In respect to the application of Ps. cx. to the Messiah, see Matt. 22: 41—45. Certain it is, from this passage, that Jesus considered and treated this Psalm as applying to himself.

The three following verses I take to be a comment on 5: 2; or to express my meaning more fully, a comparison of Christ, as a priest, with the Jewish priests, who, being themselves compassed with infirmity, were taught by experience *μετριοπαθεῖν τοῖς ἀγνοοῦσι καὶ πλανωμένοις*. It is, however, only the infirmities of one exposed to *suffering*, that are brought to view here. These Christ possessed in full, so that he could, like other priests, sympathize with those who are tempted, and tried by suffering. None of his disciples are tried more severely than he was.

The writer, however, does not complete this topic here. He breaks off, in order to pursue the course of thought to which the introduction of Melchisedek's priesthood led him, and for the sake of inserting practical warning, reproof, and exhortation, 5: 11—6: 25; and in 6: 26 he resumes the consideration of the topic thus interrupted, and shews, that as to *sinful infirmities*, Christ was not to be compared with the Jewish priests; for he had none of them. Thus while, like other priests, he was fitted to exercise compassion on those who are suffering and are tempted, he was altogether superior to them in the moral perfection of his own character. He needed no sin-offering for himself, (comp. 5: 4); but was high priest in a state, where he was *εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα τετελειωμένον*, 7: 26—28.

7. *Ὃς ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ, who, during the time of his incarnation. Ἡμέραι*, like the Heb. יָמִים, means, *time, season. Τῆς σαρκός* I understand, as designating the condition of the Logos incarnate, or *ἐν σαρκί*; comp. John 1: 1, 14. 1 Tim. 3: 16. The whole expression designates the period of the Saviour's humiliation, when "he was tempted in all points as we are, 4: 15."

Δεήσεις καὶ ἱκετηρίας.....προσενέγκας, offered up prayers and supplications. These two words are often joined, by profane writers; e. g. *ἱκετηρίας πολλὰς καὶ δεήσεις ποιούμενοι*, Isoc. de Pace. *Χωρὶς δὲ ἱκετηρίας καὶ δεήσεως*, Philo de Cherub. p. 116.

So also Lucian and Plutarch. Some critics have referred *δεήσεις* to prayers proceeding from a *sense of need*; and *ἱκετηρίας* to *submissive intercession*. But although, in some cases, the words may be thus employed, they are generally used as synonymous, or nearly so. The conjunction of both these synonymes, denotes *intensive supplication* or *intercession*; a mode of expressing intensity, which is very frequent in the sacred writings.

Πρὸς τὸν δυνάμενον σώζειν αὐτὸν ἐκ θανάτου, i. e. to the sovereign Lord of life and death, the "God in whose hands our breath is, and whose are all our ways:" a periphrasis, in this case, which means, God, who is possessed of *supreme* power, or, the sovereign Lord of life and death.

Μετὰ κραυγῆς ἰσχυρᾶς καὶ δακρύων, voce altâ et lacrymis, with loud cries and with tears or *weeping*. See Luke 22: 41—44. Matt. 26: 38, 39. 27: 46. Mark 15: 34—36. Comp. Luke 12: 50. John 12: 27, 28. *Κραυγῆς ἰσχυρᾶς* denotes the intensity of the voice, as raised high by agonizing supplication, Luke 22: 44. The Evangelists do not mention the weeping of the Saviour; but who can doubt that he did weep, when he prayed in such an agony, that he sweat as it were drops of blood, Luke 22: 44?

Καὶ εἰσακουσθεὶς ἀπὸ τῆς εὐλαβείας, and was heard in respect to that which he feared, or, *was delivered from that which he feared*. The classic sense of *εὐλάβεια* is, *fear, dread*; and this is the sense in which it is commonly employed in the Septuagint. But as the Hebrew words יִרְאָה and יָרֵא mean, *reverence* and *to revere*, as well as *fear* and *to fear* or *to dread*, so the Greek *εὐλάβεια, εὐλαβής, εὐλαβέω*, are sometimes employed to designate the idea of *reverence*, and consequently (like יִרְאַת יְהוָה) of *piety, devotion, religion*. But the usual classic sense of the word is to be preferred, in our verse, viz, *fear*, or *object of dread*, like the Hebrew מוֹרָא. *Εἰσακούω* and *ἐπακούω* are frequently employed, in the Septuagint, in order to translate the Hebrew verb עָנָה; and עָנָה very often means, *to answer a prayer* or *request*. To answer a request for deliverance, is *to deliver* or *save from*. This sense the verb עָנָה sometimes has; e. g. Ps. 22: 22, *from the horns of the wild bull* עֲנִיתָנִי, *deliver me*, (the preceding parallelism has הוֹשִׁיעֵנִי, *save me*); Job 35: 12, *from the pride of the wicked* יַעֲנֶה לֹא, *he* [God] *will not deliver*. So Ps. 118: 5, et al. We may render *εἰσακουσθείς*, then, *was delivered*. Still, this is not absolutely neces-

sary, inasmuch as *he was heard in respect to the object of fear*, gives the same sense, viz. from that which he dreaded Christ was delivered, or, his entreaties were listened to in respect to that which he dreaded. Ἀπό, like the Hebrew מִן, מִ, is sometimes employed in the sense of, *quod attinet ad*, so that it accords with the general meaning of περί; e. g. in Acts 17: 2. See Schleusner Lex. ἀπό, no. 18. Gesen. Heb. Lex. מִן no. 4. If εἰσακουσθείς be translated (as the Hebrew עָנָה in some cases should be rendered), *was delivered*, then the usual sense of ἀπό is perfectly appropriate; and, on this account, I have thought such a translation to be preferable, and made it accordingly. See Excursus XI.

8. *Καίπερ ὢν υἱός ὑπακοήν, although a Son, yet did he learn obedience by suffering*; i. e. although he was God's only and well beloved Son, a personage of such exalted dignity, yet was he put to the trial of obedience in the midst of sufferings; or, he was subjected to learn experimentally, what it is to obey in the midst of sufferings. So I interpret this somewhat difficult and much agitated verse. I cannot suppose the object of the writer to be, an assertion that Christ did not understand the nature of obedience or recognize the duty of it, before he suffered; but that it pleased God to exalt him to glory, in the way of obedience rendered by suffering as well as by action. Such is the sentiment in 2: 10. Of such an obedience our epistle speaks, in 10: 7, quoted from Ps. 40: 8, 9; and such is that mentioned in Phil. 2: 8, *obedience unto death, even the death of the cross*, which, in the sequel, is asserted to be the special ground of Christ's exaltation to the throne of the universe. To mention such an obedience here, is altogether apposite to the apostle's design; which was, fully to impress on the Hebrews the sympathizing and compassionate nature of the Saviour, and his fitness to succour those who were under sufferings and trials; comp. 2: 17, 18. 4: 15, 16. The same is implied in 5: 1, 2.

9. *Καὶ τελειωθείς αἰωνίου, then, when exalted to glory, he became the author of eternal salvation* [he procured salvation] *for all those who obey him*. For τελειωθείς, see on 2: 10, where is the same sentiment as here; and where Christ, who is here said to be αἴτιος σωτηρίας, is called τὸν ἀρχηγὸν τῆς σωτηρίας, which has the same meaning. As to chap. 2: 10, the whole of the preceding context there, is occupied with shewing the exaltation or

kingly dignity of Christ; and to this state of exaltation τελειωθείς undoubtedly refers here. There is also conveyed, by v. 9, an intimation that Christ's very sufferings stand in an intimate and necessary connexion with his exaltation to the kingly office, so that he is a *kingly* priest, as Melchisedek also was. There is evidently no necessity, however, of including vs. 7—9 in parentheses, as many commentators have done; nor of regarding them as an interruption of the apostle's discourse. The fact is, as we have seen in the illustration above, that a new topic or head is introduced by them which is broken off in the manner of Paul, in 5: 11, and resumed in 7: 26.

10. *Προσαγορευθεὶς Μελχιζεδέκ, being called by God,* [as I was saying], *a high priest, after the order of Melchisedek. Προσαγορεύω* means, *to name, to salute by calling a name, to greet.* The meaning is, that Christ is greeted, or saluted, by the name or appellation, *ἀρχιερεύς*, כֹּהֵן. In the Septuagint, Ps. 109: 4 [110: 4], and above, in v. 6, it is *ἱερεύς*. But the Hebrew כֹּהֵן means either *ἀρχιερεύς*, or *ἱερεύς*; see Lev. 4: 16, et al.; so that the apostle might render the original, in Ps. 110: 4, by either Greek word; as he has done.

Having thus introduced the subject of Christ's exaltation as priest, the nature of the comparison introduced, viz. the comparison of Christ's priesthood with that of Melchisedek, occasions the writer to stop short, in order to comment on this, and also to give utterance, in the first place, to his emotions of concern for those whom he addressed. The difficulty and obscurity of the subject, which he is about to discuss, are, in his view, occasioned principally by the low state of religious knowledge in those whom he addresses. This he tells them very plainly, in order to reprove them for the little progress they had made in Christian knowledge, as well as to guard them against objecting to what he is about to advance.

11. *Περὶ οὗ πολὺς ἡμῖν ὁ λόγος λέγειν, respecting whom we have much to say.* So Lysias in Panoc. *πολὺς ἂν εἴη μοι λόγος διηγεῖσθαι.* Dionys. Halicar. I. 23. *περὶ ὧν πολὺς ἂν εἴη λόγος.*

Καὶ δυσερμήνευτος, and difficult of explanation, from *δύς* and *ἑρμηνεύω.* Critics frequently couple the word *λέγειν* which follows, with *δυσερμήνευτος*; but the example above, from Lysias, shews that it should be associated with the former clause of the verse. The grammatical construction or arrangement I take to be this;

περὶ οὗ [*τὸ*] *λέγειν, πολὺς ἡμῖν* [*εἴη*] *ὁ λόγος*; the infinitive *λέγειν* being used as a noun in the nominative, or as the subject of the sentence, according to a common usage.

Ἐπεὶ νωθροὶ γεγόνατε ταῖς ἀκοαῖς, since ye are dull of apprehension, or, *slow in understanding. Ταῖς ἀκοαῖς*, lit. *in hearing*. But *ἀκούω, to hear*, means often *to perceive, to understand*, like the Hebrew שָׁמַע.

The reason why they are so dull in respect to understanding religious subjects, is next suggested by the writer; doubtless with the design of reproving those whom he addresses, for their neglect to make a suitable progress in Christian knowledge.

12. *Καὶ γὰρ ὀφείλοντες χρόνον, for when ye ought to be even capable of teaching, as it respects the length of time*, viz. since ye made a profession of the Christian religion. The writer, doubtless, does not mean to say, that the whole church whom he addressed should actually be teachers; but that they ought to have made advances enough in the knowledge of spiritual subjects, to be *able to teach* in them, or, in other words, ought to have made very considerable acquisitions in religious knowledge, considering the length of time that had elapsed since they professed to be Christians. *Διά, after*, so before words signifying *time;* e. g. Matt. 26: 61. Mark 14: 58. 2: 1. Acts 24: 17. Gal. 2: 1.

Πάλιν χρείαν ἔχετε τοῦ θεοῦ, ye have need that one should again teach you the very rudiments of divine doctrine. Στοιχεῖα, elements or *rudiments* of any science. *Στοιχεῖα τῆς ἀρχῆς, the rudiments of the beginning*, is the same as Horace's *elementa prima*, Serm. I. The idea is expressed by the phrase, *very rudiments* or *first elements, elementa prima. Τῶν λογίων τοῦ θεοῦ*, I should refer particularly to those parts of the Old Testament, which have a respect to the Christian religion, and especially to the Messiah, were it not that in chap. VI. 1—3, the writer has shewn that he means the rudiments of *Christian doctrine* in its *appropriate* sense. *Λογίων θεοῦ* then must mean here, *doctrines* or *communications of God*, viz. which God has revealed under the gospel, i. e. divine doctrine, or doctrines of divine original.

This feeble, imperfect, spiritual condition, the writer now describes, by a very appropriate figure, taken from the aliment and condition of young children.

Καὶ γεγόνατε χρείαν τροφῆς, and ye have become [like]

those who need milk, and not solid nourishment, lit. ye have become, those who need, etc. But the particle of similitude is, in such cases, very often omitted in the Old Testament and in the New. The meaning is, 'Ye have in spiritual things become as children are in regard to food, i. e. unable to bear or to digest any thing but the most light and simple nourishment; ye cannot understand or bear the higher and more difficult doctrines, ye cannot properly apprehend them when they are proposed to you.' *Τροφή, nourishment, any kind of food*, not *meat* only.

13. *Πᾶς γὰρ ὁ μετέχων νήπιος γάρ ἐστι, now, every one who partakes of milk, is unskilled in the doctrine of salvation, for he is a child.* *Ἄπειρος, inexpers, ineptus ad aliquam rem*, i. e. one who has not that skill or experience in regard to any thing, which is requisite to a due apprehension and consideration of it. The sentiment is, 'As he, who must be fed with milk, is yet a child; so ye, who can bear only the lighter kinds of spiritual nourishment, are yet *νήπιοι* in religion.' *Λόγου δικαιοσύνης, doctrine of salvation*, i. e. the gospel, or the Christian religion. The Hebrew צֶדֶק and צְדָקָה are often equivalent to מִשְׁפָּט, *statute, ordinance, rule of life*. It is evident, here, that *δικαιοσύνης* means, *what the Christian religion sanctions* or *ordains*. See Schleusner on *δικαιοσύνη*, no. 9. Or *δικαιοσύνη* may be here rendered, *grace, favour*, i. e. the gospel which reveals grace, favour, pardon.

14. *Τελείων δέ ἐστιν ἡ στερεὰ τροφή, but solid food is for those of mature age.* *Τελείων, adult, grown up, having attained completion in a physical respect.* See on 2: 10. 5: 9.

Τῶν διὰ τὴν ἕξιν καλοῦ, who possess organs of sense, exercised by practice, for distinguishing between good and evil. The metaphor here, as in the preceding verse, is of a mixed nature; the latter clause being appropriate to moral *τέλειοι*. The meaning is, that *solid food*, which is an image of the more difficult part of gospel doctrines, is appropriate to *full grown* men, i. e. to Christians who have come to a maturer state, and who, by experience in matters of religion and frequent reflection upon them, have made advances so as to be able to distinguish what is right and what is wrong respecting them. *Αἰσθητήρια* here means the *internal senses* of Christians, their moral powers or faculties of distinguishing and judging; although the term itself, in its *literal* acceptation, designates the *external organs of sense*. *Διάκρισιν καλοῦ καὶ κα-*

κοῦ is borrowed from the Heb. יָדַע טוֹב וָרָע. See Gen. 2: 17. Deut. 1: 39, and comp. Is. 7: 15, 16. Jonah 4: 11. It is applied, by the Hebrews, to designate a more mature and advanced state of knowledge in respect to any thing, and not simply to the mere perceiving of a difference between the moral nature of good and evil. So in the verse before us; we cannot suppose the writer to mean, that the Hebrews were not yet *τέλειοι*, in such a sense as to be able to discern the difference between good and evil, simply considered. He evidently means, that they were in such a state, as not readily to discern what was true or false in respect to the more difficult doctrines of the Christian religion; they were not as yet capable of rightly understanding and estimating them. From this state, it was their duty speedily to extricate themselves; as the writer proceeds to exhort them to do.

CHAP. VI.

1. *Διὸ ἀφέντες φερώμεθα, wherefore, leaving the first rudiments of Christian doctrine, let us proceed to a more advanced state* [of knowledge]. *Διό* I interpret here, in the usual sense. I understand the reasoning of the apostle thus; 'Wherefore, i. e. since *τέλειοι* only are capable of *στερεὰ τροφή, solid food*, viz. of receiving, digesting, and duly appropriating the higher and more difficult doctrines of Christianity, and since ye are yet but *νήπιοι*, although ye ought to be *advanced* in Christian knowledge, if regard be had to the long time that ye have professed the Christian religion, 5: 12—14; *διό, therefore*, it becomes you to quit this state of immaturity, this *νηπιότητα*, and advance to a maturer state, to a *τελειότητα*.' The reasoning is plain, when thus understood, and the connexion palpable. The word *ἀφέντες* is capable of the signification given to it by this method of interpretation. *Ἀφίημι* signifies, among other things, *relinquo, abeo, discedo, relinquo post me*, etc. and is frequently applied to quitting a thing, for the sake of going to some different place, or of engaging in a different employment; e. g. Matt. 4: 20, 22. 5: 24. 18: 12. 19: 27. John 10: 12. The meaning here I take to be this, 'Quitting the mere initial stage of pupilage, advance forward to a maturer state of instruction and knowledge;' or, 'Make such advances, that it shall be unnecessary to repeat *elementary* instruction in the principles of Christianity, vs. 2, 3.'

Others (and most commentators) understand ἀφέντες here in the sense of *omitting*, and apply it to the apostle in the following way; 'Omitting now to insist on the first elements of Christian doctrine, let me proceed to the consideration of the more difficult principles of religion, not discussing, at present, the subject of repentance, baptism, etc.; which I will do, i. e. I will discuss the higher principles, if God permit;' or, (as some interpret this last clause), 'Which [first rudiments] I shall discuss by and by, *Deo volente;*' referring καὶ τοῦτο ποιήσομεν to the *discussion* of the doctrines just mentioned.

But a difficulty in admitting this interpretation, lies in the context which follows. According to the method of interpretation just proposed, the reasoning would be thus; 'Omitting now all discussion respecting the first rudiments of Christian doctrine, I will proceed to disclose the more abstruse principles of the same; *for it is impossible* (ἀδύνατον γάρ) that apostates should be again renewed to repentance.' Is there any coherence in such reasoning? If there be, it is, at least, very difficult to see it. But does the other method proposed, relieve the difficulty? Let us see. It stands thus; 'Christian brethren, who ought by this time to be qualified, by your knowledge of religion, to become teachers of it, quit the state of ignorance in which you are. Let it not be necessary any more to teach you the first rudiments of Christian doctrine. Such progress we *must* make, *Deo volente*. Stationary we cannot remain; we must either advance or recede. But guard well, I beseech you, against receding; ἀδύνατον γάρ, etc. vs. 4—8.'

Two things, at least, must be admitted. The one, that the apostle taxes them with negligence in regard to an enlarged acquaintance with religious doctrine; the other, that he cautions them against the awful consequences of apostasy. Now does it not follow, that he considers the state of comparative ignorance in which they were, as exposing them in a peculiar manner to apostatize; and consequently, that he connects the danger of apostasy with reproof in regard to religious ignorance, so as to rouse them to more effort, in order to acquire a better acquaintance with the grounds and principles of Christianity? And is not all this founded in the nature of things, as they have always existed? Are not the ignorant most easily led away, by impostors and heretical teachers? The men who have prohibited the use of the Scriptures by the peo-

ple at large, and who labour to suppress the diffusion of general knowledge, in order that the mass of the people may be kept in ignorance, and so be moulded by them at their will, have well understood the principle to which I have alluded.

The caution of the apostle, then, I consider as amounting to this; 'Guard well against ignorance of Christian doctrines, for lapse is easy to the ignorant, and recovery exceedingly difficult or impossible.' I cannot, therefore, follow the usual method of expounding either the verse before us, or the subsequent context.

Φερώμεθα, the middle voice of *φέρω*, often signifies *to go, to come, to travel, to move* in any manner, or in any direction. Here *φερώμεθα* means, *to advance, to go forward.*

Μὴ πάλιν θεμέλιον καταβαλλόμενοι μετανοίας, not again laying the foundation with respect to repentance; not again commencing, (as we once have done), with the first elements of Christian doctrine, e. g. the subject of repentance, etc. *Μετανοίας* here means, the subject or doctrine of *μετάνοια*, see v. 2. The genitive *βαπτισμῶν διδαχῆς*, designates, in this case, the relation signified by *in respect to;* which is a very common use of the genitive; see Buttmann's Gram. § 119. 6. 1. It is plain, that the writer does not here speak of repentance as an *act*, but as a *doctrine* or subject of consideration; and so of the other subjects mentioned in the sequel. That *repentance* was inculcated as an *initial* doctrine and duty of Christianity, may be seen by consulting the following passages, Matt. 4: 17. Mark 1: 15. Acts 2: 38. 17: 30, and others of the same kind.

Ἀπὸ νεκρῶν ἔργων, from deadly works, i. e. in respect to works which cause death, misery or condemnation. Comp. 9: 14, and *τοῦ θανάτου* in 2: 14. Or *νεκρός* may be interpreted as meaning *sinful, vicious;* as in Eph. 5: 14. Rom. 6: 13. 11: 15. Rev. 3: 1. It is not important which of these senses is adopted. The one implies the other.

Καὶ πίστεως ἐπὶ θεόν, faith in God, or, in respect to him. That this is an elementary principle of Christianity, is evident from the nature of the thing, as well as from Mark 11: 22. John 14: 1. Heb. 11: 6, and many other passages of the New Testament. Here, however, *by faith in God*, is to be understood, faith in the declarations which God has made to men respecting his Son, the Saviour of the world. Comp. Acts 16: 31.

2. *Βαπτισμῶν διδαχῆς, the doctrine of baptisms.* Here the word *διδαχῆς* is supplied by the writer; and I regard it as *implied*, before the preceding *μετανοίας* and *πίστεως*. Some interpreters, however, point the text thus, *βαπτισμῶν, διδαχῆς*, i. e. *of baptisms*, of [elementary] *instruction*; which is too improbable to need discussion. The only difficulty lies in the plural word *βαπτισμῶν*; since we know of only *one* Christian baptism. Hence, Schleusner, and many other critics, refer *βαπτισμός* only to the ceremonial washings of the Jews, in all the cases where it occurs; and they suppose that *βάπτισμα* is the only appropriate term, with which the rite of Christian baptism is designated. But what has the apostle to do here with Jewish ceremonial rites, as the first elements of *Christian doctrine?* Plainly nothing; so that this exegesis cannot be admitted.

Another and better explanation is, that *βαπτισμῶν* does not differ, in any important respect, from *βαπτισμοῦ*. So, in John 1: 13, stands the plural *αἱμάτων*; in 1 Cor. 7: 2, *τὰς πορνείας*; in 2 Cor. 7: 3, *καρδίαις*; all instead of the singular, in each case. See many like cases, in Glass. Philol. Sac. I. p. 62, seq. So the plural number of verbs is often employed, when the subject is *indefinite* and of the *singular number*; e. g. Mark 5: 35. comp. Luke 8: 49. Comp. also Heb. 9: 17, *ἐπὶ νεκροῖς*. Storr supposes *βαπτισμῶν* to be used here in a kind of distributive sense, as the Hebrew plural often is; so that the sentiment is, 'the doctrine that every believer must be baptized.' But however this may be, it is clear that no stress can be laid upon the use of the *plural*, as there are so many examples where it means no more than the singular would do. Moreover, the Syriac Version has the singular here. In regard to the *doctrine of baptism* being an *elementary* doctrine, there can be no difficulty. The rite itself was an *initiatory* one, for all who professed to be Christians.

Ἐπιθέσεώς τε χειρῶν, imposition of hands. It is a very palpable mistake, into which many Christians fall, who are not well acquainted with the rites of the primitive church, to suppose that *imposition of hands* was practised only in the case of ordaining persons to the holy ministry. It was common for the apostles to bestow extraordinary gifts upon converts to Christianity, immediately after their baptism, by the imposition of hands. See Acts 2: 38, *λήψεσθε τὴν δωρεὰν τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος*, comp. Acts 8: 14—19.

19: 1—6. Hence, *ἐπιθέσεως χειρῶν* is reckoned as one of the things, the knowledge of which was communicated at an early stage of the Christian profession.

Ἀναστάσεώς τε νεκρῶν, of the resurrection of the dead. Storr, and others, understand this here only of the resurrection of the pious. But I apprehend the sense is general; as in John 5: 28, 29. Comp. Matt. 22: 31. Acts 4: 2. A *general* resurrection of the *bodies* of men, is a doctrine, which, if not left undecided by the Old Testament, is at least left in obscurity. The Jews, of the apostle's time, were divided in their opinion respecting it. Hence, it was insisted on with great earnestness by Christian preachers, as belonging to the peculiar and elementary doctrines of Christianity. It was connected, by them, with the account which every man is to render of himself to God; and such an accountability is a *fundamental* doctrine of the Christian religion.

Καὶ κρίματος αἰωνίου, and of a judgment, the consequences of which are eternal. In such a sense is *λύτρωσις* said to be *αἰωνία*, in 9: 12; and *διαθήκη* to be *αἰωνία*, in 13: 20. Both the *resurrection* and the *judgment*, in this case, pertain to the righteous and to the wicked. It is the *general* doctrine of a resurrection, and of responsibility and reward at the tribunal of God, which the writer means to describe. These doctrines were among those that were first preached, when men were to be instructed in the elements of Christianity. See Acts 17: 31. 10: 42. Rom. 2: 16. Matt. 25: 31 seq. In regard to the *eternal* consequences of judgment, see Matt. 25: 46. John 5: 29. Dan. 11: 2. 2 Thess. 1: 9. Matt. 18: 8. Mark 9: 45, 48.

3. *Καὶ τοῦτο ὁ θεός, and this will we do, if God permit;* i. e. we will advance in Christian knowledge, go on *ἐπὶ τελειότητα*, should God be pleased to spare our lives, and afford us continued opportunity of so doing. The frequency with which the writer of this epistle uses the first person plural, (*κοινωσις*), is worthy of remark. It gives a more delicate cast to his reproofs, and to his comminations.

4. *Ἀδύνατον γάρ, for it is impossible,* i. e. we will go forward in the attainment of what belongs to Christians, and not recede; for it is *impossible*, viz. that those who recede and apostatize should be recovered from their lapse; as the sequel avers. But does *ἀδύνατον* here imply *absolute impossibility*, or only *great difficulty?* The

latter, Storr and many other critics reply. To vindicate this sentiment, they appeal to Mark 10: 25, 27, and to the parallel passages in the other evangelists. But this appeal is not satisfactory. In Matt. 19: 23, seq. Mark 10: 23, seq. and Luke 18: 24, seq. (all relating to the same occurrence), Jesus is represented as saying, "*πῶς δυσκόλως* shall a rich man enter into the kingdom of God!" He then adds, "It is easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle, than for a rich man to enter into the kingdom of God." His disciples are astonished at this, and ask, '*How is it possible, that* any one [any rich man] can be saved, *τίς ἄρα δύναται σωθῆναι;* Jesus replies, "With men this is *ἀδύνατον*; but with God all things are *δύνατα*." Surely he does not mean merely, that this is *very difficult* with men, but, that it is *beyond their power* to accomplish it.

The other examples of the use of this word in the New Testament, are not at all adapted to favour the exegesis of Storr; e. g. Acts 14: 8. Rom. 8: 3. 15: 1, where the word, however, is figuratively employed. But, if the writer of the epistle to the Hebrews is to be compared with himself, then is it quite certain, that *ἀδύνατον* will not bear the qualified sense, which Storr puts upon it. Comp. Heb. 6: 18. 10: 4. 11: 6, all clear cases of *absolute impossibility*, not of mere *relative difficulty*. These are all the instances in which the word is found, in the New Testament. Nor will a resort to *classic* usage any better defend the interpretation of Storr.

Besides, if it could be shewn, that such a qualified sense were agreeable to the *usus loquendi*, in some cases, and therefore *possible*, a comparison with Heb. 10: 26—31, would destroy all appearance of *probability* that such a sense is to be admitted here. If there "remains no more sacrifice for sin" (Heb. 10: 26), for those who have apostatized, then is there no hope of salvation for them; as is clear from Heb. 10: 28—31. Moreover, to say merely, that it is *very difficult* to recover the lapsed Christians of whom the apostle is going to speak, would be at variance with the imagery employed to describe them and the fate that awaits them, in vs. 7, 8. For all these reasons, such an explanation of *ἀδύνατον* cannot be admitted.

Τοὺς ἅπαξ φωτισθέντας; *those who have been once enlightened*, i. e. instructed in the principles of Christianity. So *φωτίζω*, in

John 1: 9. Eph. 3: 9. Heb. 10: 32. In all the other passages of the New Testament, where this word occurs, it is employed in the sense of *shining upon, throwing light upon, disclosing*. It does not, in itself considered, imply *saving illumination*, but illumination or instruction simply, as to the principles of the Christian religion.

Γευσαμένους τε τῆς δωρεᾶς ἐπουρανίου, and have tasted of the heavenly gift. Γευσαμένους, tasted, does not mean, *extremis labris leviter degustare*, merely *to sip*, or simply *to apply for once to the palate*, so as just to perceive the taste of a thing; but it means, *the full enjoyment, perception*, or *experience* of a thing. When the Greek writers wish to communicate the former idea, they add *χείλεσιν ἄκροις* to the phrase; e. g. "They are witnesses, *οἱ μὴ χείλεσιν ἄκροις γευσάμενοι τῆς φιλοσοφίας ἀλλὰ ἑστιαθέντες, who have not only tasted with the extreme part of the lips* [sipped] *philosophy, but feasted upon it*, Philo. Lib. I. de Monarchia. p. 816. So Chrysostom, *ἄκροις τοῖς χείλεσιν γεύσασθαι*, Hom. on Johan. 5: 19. But when a *full* experience or perception of any thing is meant, *γεύομαι* is used simply; e. g. *οἱ γευσάμενοι τῆς ἀρετῆς*, Philo. de Abraham. oper. I. p. 14. So *τοῦ ἀθανάτου γνώσεως γεύπασθαι*, Clem. Rom. I. 38.

In the New Testament, *θανάτου γεύεσθαι* is, *to experience death*; e. g. Matt. 16: 28. Mark 9: 1. Luke 9: 27. John 8: 52. Heb. 2: 9. Comp. also Luke 14: 24. 1 Pet. 2: 3. So Herod. VI. 5, *γεύεσθαι ἐλευθερίας, to experience* [to enjoy] *freedom*. Pindar, Nem. Od. V. 596, *πόνων γεύεσθαι, to undergo toils*. Soph. Trach. 1108, *ἄλλων τε μόχθων μυρίων ἐγευσάμην, I have suffered a thousand other evils*. So the Hebrew טָעַם, Prov. 31: 18. Ps. 34: 9.

But what is the *heavenly gift*, which they have enjoyed, or the benefits of which they have experienced? Some have explained it as being Christ himself, by comparing it with John 4: 10. But it is doubtful whether *δωρεάν* there means Christ. It is more probable, that it means *beneficium*, i. e. the kindness or favour which God bestowed, in vouchsafing an opportunity to the Samaritan woman, to converse with the Saviour.

Others have represented *δωρεάν*, as being the extraordinary gift of the Holy Spirit to Christians, in the primitive age of Christianity; and they have compared the phrase here with *πνεῦμα ἅγιον*, in Acts 8: 19, which means the special gifts of the Spirit, and

which in 8: 20 is called *τὴν δωρεὰν τοῦ θεοῦ*. But the objection to this is, that the sequel of our text contains a *repetition* of the same idea, once at least, if not twice.

For these reasons, I prefer the interpretation which makes *δωρεὰς ἐπουρανίου* the same here, as *κλήσεως ἐπουρανίου* in 3: 1, i. e. the proffered blessings or privileges of the gospel. The sense is then plain and facile; (1) They had been instructed in the elementary doctrines of Christianity, *φωτισθέντας*. (2) They had enjoyed the privileges or benefits of living under a Christian dispensation, i. e. the means of grace which the gospel afforded; and this is truly *δωρεὰ ἐπουράνιος*. I much prefer this mode of interpretation to any of the others.

Καὶ μετόχους γενηθέντας πνεύματος ἁγίου, and have been made partakers of the Holy Spirit. I understand this of the extraordinary gifts and influences of the Spirit, which the primitive Christians enjoyed, and which were often bestowed by the imposition of the apostles' hands. See above, on *ἐπιθέσεώς τε χειρῶν*, in v. 2. *Γενηθέντας* is a more unusual word, in such a connexion as the present, than *γενομένους*; but still, there are sufficient examples to shew, that occasional custom sanctions the use of it in such cases as the present.

5. *Καὶ καλὸν γευσαμένους θεοῦ ῥῆμα, and have tasted the good word of God*, i. e. enjoyed the consolations administered, or the hopes excited, by the divine promises which the gospel proffers. *Γευσαμένους* (as above) *experienced, known by experience.* Above, it is construed with the genitive after it; here with the accusative; both according to Greek usage, although the former method predominates.

Καλὸν θεοῦ ῥῆμα, the divine promise, i. e. of good. So דָּבָר טוֹב means, in Jer. 29: 10. 33: 14; also in Joshua 21: 45. 23: 14, 15, in which last verse it is opposed to דְּבַר רַע, *promise of evil, commination.* *Καλὸν ῥῆμα* means, *the word which respects good*, i. e. the promise of blessings or favours. So Paul calls the gospel, *ἐπαγγελίαν θεοῦ ἐν Χριστῷ*, 2 Cor. 1: 20. I prefer this simple method of explanation to all others. The gradation, moreover, of the discourse is more perceptible, than if *ῥῆμα* be here construed as indicating merely *εὐαγγέλιον*, which would make the whole clause to signify nearly, if not exactly, the same as *ἅπαξ φωτισθέντας*.

Δυνάμεις τε μέλλοντος αἰῶνος, and the miracles of the gospel dispensation. The sense here given to *δυνάμεις* is frequent in the New Testament; see Matt. 7: 22. 11: 20, 21, 23. 13: 58. Mark 6: 5. Luke 10: 13. Acts 2: 22, al. I apprehend that the writer refers here to those extraordinary, miraculous occurrences, which took place in confirmation of Christianity; viz. such as are adverted to in chap. 2: 4. The phrase, *δυνάμεις μέλλοντος αἰῶνος*, differs from the preceding *μετόχους πνεύματος ἁγίου*, in this respect, viz. that the latter relates to the *special* gifts and influences of the Spirit, bestowed *in general* upon the primitive disciples; while the former refers particularly to miracles of the *highest* order, which afforded peculiar proof that Christianity was a divine religion, and which are appealed to as such in 2: 4. In regard to *μέλλοντος αἰῶνος*, see on *οἰκουμένην μέλλουσαν*, in 2: 5.

Thus interpreted, there is a regular gradation in the whole passage. (1) They had been taught the principles or doctrines of Christianity. (2) They had enjoyed the privileges or means of grace, which the new religion afforded. (3) They had experienced, in general, various gifts and graces bestowed by the Spirit. (4) They had cherished the hopes which the promises of the gospel inspire. (5) They had witnessed, (and perhaps he means to say, that some of them had experienced), those special miraculous powers, by which the gospel was fully shewn to be a religion from God; comp. 2: 4. Thus they had the *fullest* evidence, internal and external, of the divine origin and nature of the Christian religion. Consequently, if they apostatized from it, there remained no hope of their recovery.

6. *Καὶ παραπεσόντας, and have fallen away, have made defection from*, viz. from the gospel, or from all the experience and evidence before mentioned; *παραπίπτω* governing the genitive. The connexion stands thus, *Ἀδύνατον γὰρ τοὺς ἅπαξ φωτισθέντας.... γευσαμένους τε καὶ γενηθέντας.... καὶ γευσαμένους καὶ παραπεσόντας.* In compound verbs, *παρά* is often taken to denote *deterioration*; e. g. *παραφρονεῖν, desipere; παραλογίζεσθαι, male ratiocinari; παραρυθμίζειν, deformare;* so *παραπίπτειν, deficere ab.* The *falling away* or *defection*, which is here meant, is a renunciation of Christianity, and a return to Judaism. This implies, of course, a return to a state of active enmity and hostility to the Christian religion.

Πάλιν ἀνακαινίζειν εἰς μετάνοιαν, again to be renewed by repentance. *Πάλιν* belongs to *ἀνακαινίζειν*, not only by common usage in respect to the position of the adverb, when placed immediately before the verb which it qualifies, but the sense here requires it. The writer does not mean to say, 'Those who have a second time fallen away; but, that *those who fall away cannot be again*, or, *a second time brought to repentance.* Drusius, Cappell, Abresch, and others, take *ἀνακαινίζειν* here in the passive sense, as equivalent to *ἀνακαινίζεσθαι*; and construe it, in connexion with what precedes, in this manner; 'It is impossible for those who have been once instructed, etc. *to be renewed* to repentance.' The simple grammatical construction of *ἀνακαινίζειν*, as it now stands in the *active* voice, is thus; 'It is impossible again *to renew* by repentance those who have been once instructed, etc.' If the latter method of construing the sentence he adopted, who is the subject of the verb *ἀνακαινίζειν*? i. e. who is the agent that is to produce this renovation? Is it God, i. e. the Holy Spirit, or Paul, or others? Brettschneider (Lex.) understands the word in an *active* sense, and supposes that Christian teachers are the agents to whom the writer refers. Storr renders it indefinitely, "Man kann unmöglich wieder bessern," *one cannot possibly produce another amendment.* But instead of saying *one cannot*, in this case, I should prefer understanding *ἀνακαινίζειν* in an *impersonal* sense, and rendering it in English by our passive verb; since many verbs used impersonally convey a passive sense. See Heb. Gram. § 190. 2. note 1. 2.

There is still another construction which may be made of the passage, and which is a very common Greek one; viz. *πάλιν ἀνακαινίζειν τοὺς ἅπαξ φωτισθέντας καὶ παραπεσόντας, ἀδύνατον, to renew, or, the renewal of, persons once instructed and who have apostatized, is impossible.* In this case, the infinitive *ἀνακαινίζειν* is used as a noun, and makes the *subject* of the proposition. This would afford the same sense, as that which was last suggested above.

Εἰς μετάνοιαν, by repentance; so Chrysostom, Erasmus, and others. *Εἰς*, with the accusative, often signifies the *instrument* or *means.* If it be construed otherwise, (as in the version which I have made), the sense will be 'To renew them so that they will repent.' See Excursus XII.

Ἀνασταυροῦντας ἑαυτοῖς τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ θεοῦ, since they have crucified for themselves the Son of God. Chrysostom construes *ἀνασταυροῦντας* as meaning *πάλιν σταυροῦντας*; and so our English translators, and many others. But this is not conformable to common Greek usage. *Ἀνά*, in composition, merely augments the intensity of a verb, if indeed it produces any effect upon its signification; for oftentimes it does not, e. g. *ἀναζητεῖν, ἀναιρεῖν, ἀναθεωρεῖν, ἀναπληρόειν*, etc. That the word in question is to be *figuratively* taken, is plain from the nature of the case. Actual *physical* crucifixion is out of the question. It means, then, *to treat with the greatest ignominy and contempt.*

But what does *ἑαυτοῖς* mean? It is susceptible of two interpretations. (1) As *dativus incommodi*, i. e. *to their own hurt, shame*, etc. So Storr. See Winer's N. T. Gram. § 24. 2. *b*. (2) It may be construed as Hebrew pronouns in the dative frequently are, viz. as *pleonastic*; e. g. לְךָ־לְךָ, *go for thyself*, i. e. go; לוֹ נָס, *he has fled for himself*, i. e. he has fled; Heb. Gram. § 210. 3. I incline to the latter mode of explanation. Perhaps the shade of idea is, 'Crucifying, so far as they are concerned,' or, 'Themselves being concerned in the transaction of crucifying.'

Καὶ παραδειγματίζοντας, and exposed him to public shame; comp. Matt. 1: 19. By renouncing their adherence to Christianity, they would openly declare their belief that Christ was only an impostor, and of course, that he suffered justly as a malefactor. By returning again to Judaism, they would approve of what the Jews had done; and thus they would, as it were, crucify Christ, and expose him to be treated by unbelievers with scorn and contumely. Every one knows, that an apostate from a good cause gives new occasion, by the act of apostasy, for the enemies of that cause to utter all the malignity of their hearts against it. In this sense, apostates expose the Saviour to public infamy, when they renounce all regard for him, and join with those who view him as an impostor and a malefactor.

The two participles, *ἀνασταυροῦντας καὶ παραδειγματίζοντας*, I regard as grammatically connected with the preceding ones thus; *τοὺς ἅπαξ φωτισθέντας καὶ παραπεσόντας ἀνασταυροῦντας καὶ παραδειγματίζοντας*; the two latter words being in *apposition* with the preceding participles, and added for the sake of giving intensity to the whole description. On this account, *καὶ* is omitted before *ἀνασταυροῦντας*.

7. *Γῆ γὰρ ὑετόν, now the earth which drinketh in the rain that frequently comes upon it.* *Γῆ* is used for *land cultivated* or *uncultivated.* Here it designates the former; as is evident from the sequel of the sentence. The image of the earth being *thirsty*, and *drinking* in the showers, is common in many languages.

Καὶ τίκτουσα βοτάνην, and produceth fruits. *Τίκτουσα* is often applied, by classical writers, to the production of fruits. *Βοτάνην*, like the Hebrew עֵשֶׂב, means, *any kind of grain, any produce of vegetation*, which is fitted for the service of man. But this use is Hebraistic. By classic usage, *βοτάνη* means, *herbage* or *vegetation*, not including bread-corn.

Εὔθετον ἐκείνοις δι' οὓς γεωργεῖται, useful to those on account of whom it is cultivated. *Εὔθετον* means, in its primary sense, *well situated, well located;* e. g. it is applied to a convenient harbour for ships, etc. *Useful, appropriate*, etc. are secondary meanings, which the word frequently has. *Δι' οὓς, on account of whom.* That this is the *usual* signification of *διά* with the accusative, all will acknowledge; and as the sense demands no departure here from the usual construction, it is better to retain it, than to translate *by whom.*

Μεταλαμβάνει εὐλογίας ἀπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ, lit. *receiveth blessings from God.* But what is the meaning of this? Is it, that the earth is, when thus fruitful, contemplated with satisfaction or complacency by its creator? Or does it mean, 'The earth which thus produces useful fruits, is rendered still more fruitful by divine beneficence?' The latter seems better to accord with the Hebrew idiom. E. g. when Jacob approaches Isaac, clad in Esau's perfumed garments, Isaac says, *The odour of my son, is like the odour of a field which God has blessed*, i. e. of a fruitful field, with blossoming herbage. So, on the contrary, the *curse* of the earth, in Gen. 3: 17, is explained in v. 18 by adding, "Thorns and thistles shall it bring forth unto thee." In Mark 11: 14, our Saviour says of the *barren* fig tree, "Let no one ever henceforth eat any fruit of thee;" to which Peter afterwards alluding, says, "Lo! the fig tree which thou didst *curse*, Mark 11: 21." In 2 Cor. 9: 6, Paul says, "He who soweth *ἐπ' εὐλογίαις, bountifully*, shall reap *ἐπ' εὐλογίαις, bountifully.*" Agreeably to this idiom, the phrase in question might be explained, *is rendered still more fertile*, or *productive, by God.* But although most commentators of note have

adopted such an interpretation, I hesitate to receive it; and this, because the metaphor thus explained does not seem well adapted to the object for which it is used. The image of the *fruitful* earth is designed to signify, 'Christians who bring forth fruits under divine cultivation.' Supposing, then, that such Christians are here designated, (as plainly is the case), does the writer mean merely to say, in addition, that they will be rendered still more fruitful in good works? Or does he mean to say, that when they thrive under the cultivation which they enjoy, they will obtain divine approbation and complacency? I incline to the latter interpretation, as tending more directly to exhibit the object which the apostle has in view.

Moreover, the antithesis in v. 8, presents the image of displeasure, of punishment. Consequently, the image of complacency, of reward, is presented in v. 7. I should, then, rather interpret the phrase, *receiveth blessings from God*, as referring to the complacency or approbation with which God regards the fruitful earth. The sense is similar to that, in which he is said, in Gen. 1., to have regarded all the works of his hands, and considered them as *good*. The increased fruitfulness of the earth would indeed be the *consequence* of the divine blessing; and may, by metonymy, be taken for the blessing itself. But the other method of exegesis seems more simple. I might say, perhaps, that it is rendered almost certain by v. 8, where the earth, which brings forth thorns and thistles, is considered merely as *κατάρας ἐγγύς, nigh to a curse*, i. e. in danger of one. Yet, if commentators have rightly construed *εὐλογίας*, in v. 7, as meaning *fruitfulness*, then *κατάρα* in v. 8 must mean *barrenness*. But the land is *already* barren, which produces only thorns and briars; consequently it is not merely *nigh to barrenness* as a curse to come. As then the antithesis of *εὐλογίας* (viz. *κατάρα*), does not mean *barrenness*, so *εὐλογίας* does not mean, *fruitfulness*.

8. *Ἐκφέρουσα δὲ* [sc. *ἡ γῆ*] *ἐγγύς, but the earth, which bringeth forth thorns and briars, is useless and near to utter rejection, which will end in burning. Κατάρα, exsecratio, maledictio, extrema atque dirissima devotio.* Such barren ground, producing nothing but thorns and briars, is not only useless to the owners, but is given up or devoted by them to be overrun with fire, and to have all its worthless productions consumed. The explanation of this

phrase in our Lexicons and in most of the commentaries, seems to me plainly incongruous, as I have just hinted above. Is not the earth which produces nothing but thorns and briars, already *barren?* How then can this earth, be merely *καταράς ἐγγύς*, i. e. (as they explain it) only *near to barrenness?* The method of interpretation above proposed, avoids this incongruity, and adopts a more easy and natural explanation. Such earth is (1) Useless, *ἀδόκιμος*, *deserving reprobation.* (2) An object of execration, or nigh to being given up to the flames, which at last will consume all its worthless productions; i. e. when the owner of such barren ground has made the experiment, long enough to see what its qualities are (*ἐδοκίμασε*), and finds it to be barren, then he considers it as *ἀδόκιμος, proved to be worthless after trial, to be condemned*, and determines speedily to abandon it (*καταράς ἐγγύς*), and to subject it to the flames. *Ἧς τὸ τέλος εἰς καῦσιν, which* [*κατάρα*] *will end in* [will be accomplished or completed by] *burning. Εἰς καῦσιν* is Hebraism, corresponding to the use of the infinitive *nominascens*, with the prefix לְ, Heb. Gram. § 200. 3. So Is. 44: 15, וְהָיָה לְבָעֲרָה, LXX. *ἵνα ᾖ εἰς καῦσιν· and it shall be burned.* This mode of interpretation represents the *execration* of barren land (*κατάρα*), as ending in *καῦσις*; which agrees with fact.

Others refer *ἧς* to *γῆ*, i. e. the end of which land is burning. But I prefer the grammatical antecedent, *κατάρα.*

Thus construed, the whole affords a very striking image of the condition of the Hebrews. 'You,' the writer says, 'are enjoying abundant means of spiritual improvement. If you act in a manner worthy of such privileges, God will approve and bless. But if you disobey the gospel, and become wholly unfruitful in respect to Christian graces, then you are exposed to final rejection and endless punishment. The doom of all apostates is near, and the sequel will be tremendous.'

But lest what he had now said might wear the appearance of too much severity, and seem to imply a great degree of distrust or want of confidence in respect to those whom he addressed, the writer proceeds to shew what is the real state of his feelings towards them, and that he has, out of affection for them and solicitude for their highest welfare, so plainly and fully set before them the danger to which they were exposed.

9. *Πεπείσμεθα δὲ λαλοῦμεν, but we confidently hope for*

better things respecting you, beloved, even those connected with salvation, although we thus speak. Κρείττονα [i. e. *πράγματα*] I understand as referring to what had just been said, in which the conduct and the doom of apostates had been represented. *Πεπείσμεθα κρείττονα* then means, 'I confidently hope that you will neither imitate the conduct, nor undergo the doom, of apostates, whose end is *εἰς καῦσιν*.'

Ἐχόμενα σωτηρίας, lit. *near to, conjoined with, salvation.* The form of expression appears as if it were designed to correspond with the preceding *κατάρας ἐγγύς*; i. e. as apostates are *κατάρας ἐγγύς*, so those, who persevere in maintaining the true religion, are *ἐχόμενοι σωτηρίας*; i. e. their salvation is at hand, their time of deliverance from trials, and their season of reward, is certain, and will not be long protracted. To refer *σωτηρίας* here merely to the *temporal* safety of believing Hebrews, seems to me very foreign to the object of the writer; although some critics of note have done this.

10. *Οὐ γὰρ ἄδικος ὁ θεός, for God is not unkind*, or, *God is kind.* The opposite of *ἄδικος* is *δίκαιος*, which, among other meanings, not unfrequently bears that of *kind, benevolent, indulgent, merciful*; see Matt. 1: 19. John 17: 25. 1 John 1: 9. So in Hebrew, צַדִּיק and צְדָקָה often mean, *kind, kindness, merciful, mercy*, etc. *Ἄδικος*, therefore, may mean *unkind, unmerciful* etc; and this sense of the word is most appropriate to the passage.

Τοῦ ἔργου ὑμῶν, καὶ τῆς ἀγάπης. Many codices, and most editions, read *τοῦ ἔργου ὑμῶν καὶ τοῦ κόπου τῆς ἀγάπης.* But Griesbach, Knapp, and Tittmann, omit *τοῦ κόπου*; which, however, is defended and received by many critics of good reputation. *Ἔργον* and *κόπος* are not unfrequently joined by the sacred writers; e. g. 1 Thess. 1: 3. Rev. 2: 2. 14: 13. But the weight of authority appears to be against the genuineness of *κόπου* here.

Instead of putting a comma after *ὑμῶν*, we may point the phrase thus, *τοῦ ἔργου ὑμῶν καὶ τῆς ἀγαπης*: regarding *τῆς ἀγάπης* as sustaining the place of an adjective in respect to *ἔργου*. Such constructions are very common in the sacred writings, i. e. Hendiadys. The translation would then be, *your benevolent labour*; or (if this be more agreeable), *your labour and benevolence, which ye have exhibited.* But, on the whole, I rather prefer making *ἔργον* refer to the *efforts* which the Hebrew Christians had made,

and *ἀγάπη* to the state of mind toward God which they had cherished. I have translated accordingly.

Εἰς τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ, toward him, i. e. toward God, or toward Christ. So *ὄνομα* is often used for person; e. g. Matt. 6: 9: John 17: 26. Acts 10: 43. John 20: 31. Acts 4: 10. So שֵׁם, *name* in Hebrew, Ex. 23: 21. 1 K. 8: 29. 3: 2. Ps. 20: 1, et al. saepe.

Διακονήσαντες διακονοῦντες, having performed kind offices to Christians, and in still performing them. *Διακονέω* signifies, not merely to supply the wants of others by pecuniary aid, and by alms, but also to assist them in any way by offices of humanity and kindness. In this enlarged sense, it seems natural to understand it here. *Ἁγίοις, Christians*, i. e. those who were *consecrated* to God, or to Christ; comp. 3: 1.

11. *Τὴν αὐτὴν ἐνδείκνυσθαι σπουδὴν τέλους, may exhibit the same diligence, for the sake of a full assurance of hope even to the end*, i. e. the end of life, or the end of their probationary state; comp. 3: 6. *Σπουδήν, strenuous endeavour, diligent exertion, sedulity.* The meaning is, 'I wish you to continue active and benevolent efforts, such as you have already made, even to the end of your Christian course, so as to acquire, or, to preserve the full assurance of Christian hope.' *Πληροφορία* and *πληροφορέω* are New Testament and ecclesiastical words, not employed by the classics. *Πληροφορία* is a *full burden* or *lading*. If applied to a fruit tree, it would designate the fulness or large burden of the fruit; applied to the lading of a vessel, it would denote the fulness of the cargo. Phavorinus explains *πληροφόρησον* by *πλήρωσον*; and, in like manner, *πληροφορίαν* here does not appear to differ from *πλήρωμα* or *πλήρωσιν*. The meaning of the writer is, 'I desire that your diligence in good works should be persevered in, so that you may continue to cherish a full or confident hope, viz. of salvation, even to the end of life.' In this way, they would be most effectually guarded against apostasy; for he who, on true grounds, cherishes the hope, which the Christian religion encourages, of future glory and reward, will hardly be tempted to abandon his religion, and exchange it for another.

12. *Ἵνα μὴ νωθροὶ γένησθε, that ye may not be remiss*, viz. in the discharge of your Christian duties. *Νωθροί, tardi, segnes*, is applied either to body or mind, to external actions or internal conceptions.

Μιμηταὶ δὲ τῶν διὰ πίστεως ἐπαγγελίας, but imitators of those, who through faith and patient expectation have entered on the possession of promised blessings, i. e. who after continued belief (*πίστεως*) in the existence of those blessings, and patient waiting (*μακροθυμίας*) until the time of trial is finished for the possession of them, have at last realized the object of all their faith and patient expectation. *Πίστις* means here, belief in the reality of proffered future blessedness, (see Heb. 11: 1, 2 seq.); and *μακροθυμία* the patient waiting for it, amid all the troubles and trials of life. Some make a Hendiadys of the two words *πίστεως* and *μακροθυμίας*, and render them *patient faith*. I prefer the other method of explanation, as communicating a fuller meaning of the apostle's words.

Κληρονομούντων τὰς ἐπαγγελίας. Κληρονομέω, to acquire, to obtain possession of, see on chap. 1: 4. *Ἐπαγγελίας* in the plural, in order to indicate promises of various kinds, both in respect to temporal and spiritual good, the proffered blessings which the ancient worthies did at last enjoy.

How directly it was to the writer's purpose, to exhort the Hebrews to persevering faith, and patient waiting for future blessings proffered by the Christian religion, is too evident to need any illustration. Such a course would be directly opposite to that abandonment of faith and discouragement of mind, which led directly to apostasy.

13. *Τῷ γὰρ Ἀβραὰμ θεός, when, for example, God had made a promise to Abraham. Γάρ*, introduced in such a connexion, i. e. between the proposal of a doctrine or encouragement, and the relation of a fact which is to illustrate it, may well be explained by the phrase, *for example*; as it conveys the same idea in Greek, which these words do in English.

Ἐπεὶ κατ' οὐδενὸς ἑαυτοῦ, seeing he could swear by no greater, he swore by himself. Εἶχε, could, poterat. Comp. Mark 14: 8. Luke 7: 42. 12: 4. 14: 14. John 14: 30. Lucian, Dial. Mort. 21. 2, "Concerning all these things, *εἰπεῖν ἂν ἔχοιμι, I could speak.*" Elian. Var. Hist. I. 25, "I honour thee *ὅπηπερ καὶ ὅπως ἔχω*, in whatever way and whenever *I can*."

Κατ' οὐδενός. The genitive, with *κατὰ* before it, usually follows the verb *ὄμνυμι*, when the object is designated by which a person swears. So Aesop. Fab. 68, *ἡ μὲν σὺς ὤμνυε κατὰ τῆς Ἀφ-*

φοδίτης, swore by Venus. The accusative with *κατά*, or the dative with *ἐν*, may also be used.

Ὤμοσε καθ' ἑαυτοῦ, Hebrew נִשְׁבַּעְתִּי בִּי, Gen. 22: 16. The formula of an oath of this kind, is found in Num. 14: 21, חַי אֲנִי. So in Num. 14: 28, חַי אָנִי נְאֻם יְהוָה; and in Deut. 32: 40, חַי אֲנֹכִי לְעוֹלָם, *I live forever.*

14. *Λέγων ἦ μήν πληθυνῶ σε, saying, I will greatly bless thee, and exceedingly multiply thee,* i. e. I will give thee a numerous offspring. In Gen. 22: 17, which is quoted here, instead of simply *πληθυνῶ σε,* the Hebrew runs thus, וָאָרֵךְ אָרְבֶּה אֶת־זַרְעֲךָ, *I will greatly multiply thy seed;* but in Gen. 17: 2, it is אַרְבֶּה אֹתְךָ בִּמְאֹד מְאֹד, *I will multiply thee.* The apostle appears to unite both expressions, in the quotation before us. The obvious idea of both passages is, 'I will give thee a very numerous posterity.'

Μήν, certo, profecto, i. q. *ὄντως. Εὐλογῶν εὐλογήσω . . . πληθύνων πληθυνῶ.* Such a reduplication is very common in Hebrew, where, for the most part, it denotes *intensity,* Heb. Gram. § 199. 2. The *frequency* of it, in the Hellenistic writers, is Hebraism; but the formula itself is not without many examples in the Greek writers. E. g. Lucian. Dial. Menel. sub fine, *ἰδὼν εἶδον.* Xen. Cyrop. V. *πείθων ἔπεισε.* VIII. *ὑπακούων ὑπήκουσα.* Polyb. *εὐχόμενος ἠύξατο τοῖς θεοῖς.* Herod. IV. 23, *καταφεύγων καταφεύγῃ.* Diod. Sic. Tom. I. p. 717, *καταπίμψας ἔπεμψε.* That *intensity* is designed in our text, is clear from consulting the context in Gen. XXII. and XVII.

Πληθυνῶ is found in what is usually called the *second future circumflex.* But verbs in *λ, μ, ν, ρ,* have no other future; see Buttmann, Gram. § 86. 8.

15. *Καὶ οὕτω μακροθυμήσας ἐπαγγελίας, and so, having patiently waited, he obtained the promised blessing. Καὶ οὕτω,* may be construed as equivalent to *καὶ τότε,* vel *καὶ ἔπειτα, and then,* and *afterwards.* So *οὕτω* in Acts 7: 8. 20: 11. Rom. 11: 26. Thess. 4: 17. Rev. 11: 5. Schneider (Lex.), *οὕτω, folglich, sonach.* Schleusner (Lex.), *οὕτω, sic tandem, tum demum, deinceps etiam.* But I rather prefer the sense of *so* here, which means, *in accordance with the promises just recited. Ἐπέτυχε τῆς ἐπαγγελίας,* the noun being in the genitive: for *ἐπιτυγχάνω* governs either the genitive or accusative; see Matt. Gr. Gram. § 363. 5.

But what was the promised blessing which he obtained? The

same, I reply, which the preceding context designates, viz. the blessing of a posterity, which should become numerous. When Abraham was called by God out of Haran, and the promise of a numerous posterity made to him, he was seventy five years old, Gen. 12: 1—4. Twenty four years elapsed after this, while he was a sojourner in a strange land without any fixed place of abode, before the manner in which this promise would be fulfilled was revealed to him, Gen. 17: 1—16. It was only when he was an hundred years old, that the promised blessing of a son, from whom should spring a great nation, was obtained, Gen. 21: 1—5. The preternatural birth of such a son, was deemed by Abraham a sufficient pledge, on the part of God, that all which he had promised respecting him would be fulfilled, Gen. 22: 15—18. Heb. 11: 8—12, 17—19. Rom. 4: 17—22. Other blessings, besides that of a numerous posterity, were connected with the birth of Isaac and the faith of Abraham, Gen. XXII. latter part of v. 17 with v. 18. These blessings Abraham did not obtain, indeed, by *actual* possession; but by *anticipation*, *confident hope*, and *unwavering faith* in the promises of God; comp. John 8: 56. In our text, however, the apostle refers to the promised blessing of a son, which after long waiting, Abraham obtained.

16. *Ἄνθρωποι μὲν γὰρ ὀμνύουσι, now men swear by one who is superior*, i. e. men appeal to God, when taking an oath, as a witness of their sincerity, and as an avenger of falsehood and perjury.

Καὶ πάσης αὐτοῖς ὁ ὅρκος, and the oath for confirmation makes an end of all dispute among them; i. e. an oath, that contesting parties will abide by terms of amity and concord agreed upon, puts an end to the disputes which had existed, the parties relying upon an engagement of a nature so solemn. An oath, then, is the highest pledge of fidelity which men can give. *Αὐτοῖς* is the dative after *ἀντιλογίας*, viz. *ἀντιλογίας* [*ἡ ἐστι*] *αὐτοῖς*.

Such is the custom of men, when *ἀντιλογία, contradiction, question, calling in question, dispute*, is to be quieted. God has condescended to act in a similar way, for our encouragement, and to confirm our belief in his promises.

17. *Ἐν ᾧ περισσότερον τῆς ἐπαγγελίας, on account of which*, (i. e. because an oath removes all dispute or doubt) *God, desirous of shewing these to whom the promises are made. Ἐν ᾧ*,

on account of this, see Wahl on ἐν, no. 5. *Περισσότερον, abundantly, modo eximio, insigniter.* *Ἐπιδεῖξαι, to demonstrate, to exhibit so as to prove.* *Κληρονόμοις*, i. e. Christians; comp. 4: 1, 3, 9.

Τὸ ἀμετάθετον τῆς βουλῆς αὐτοῦ, the immutability of his purpose, or, *of his decree*; for the *will* of God is the decree of God.

Ἐμεσίτευσεν ὅρκῳ, interposed by an oath. *Μεσιτεύω* means, according to classical usage, *to act the part of a mediator, to be an internuntius, conciliator*, between two parties. But here, this sense is impossible. God is not a mediator between himself and the heirs of the promise. The sense of *interposing*, then, becomes a necessary one. So the Vulgate, *interposuit jusjurandum.* He made a *μεσίτην* (so to speak) by an oath, interposed between himself and the heirs of promise; i. e. he made an oath the means of removing all doubt or question, on their part, whether he would faithfully perform what he had promised.

18. *Ἵνα διὰ δύο πραγμάτων θεόν, so that by two immutable things, in regard to which it is impossible that God should prove faithless*; i. e. since men's doubts are removed by appeal to an oath, God, in condescension to their weakness, has also made confirmation of his promises by an oath, so that there might be no possible ground of doubt. But what are the *two immutable things?* His promise and his oath, answer almost all the commentators and critics. But there is room to doubt the correctness of this interpretation. The apostle in the preceding context has mentioned two oaths of God, which have respect to the salvation of believers. The one is in the context immediately preceding, v. 13; which in Gen. 22: 15—18, stands connected with the promise of a blessing to all nations (v. 18), through the seed of Abraham, i. e. through the Messiah. The other is implied in Heb. 3: 11; where the oath that unbelievers shall be excluded from the rest of God, implies of course an assurance of the same nature, that believers shall be admitted to it; comp. 4: 5, 6. Perhaps, however, the second oath, is that, by which the Messiah is constituted a high priest after the order of Melchisedek, Ps. 110: 4; and which had been twice adverted to by the writer, in the preceding part of his epistle, 5: 6, 10. This would best agree with the sequel, in 6: 20, where the writer recurs to the order of Christ's high priesthood, and thus shews that it was, at that time, in his mind. Here, then, are the

two *immutable things*, in which believers may confide; viz. first, the oath that Abraham should have a Son (the Messiah), in whom all nations should be blessed, Gen. 22: 18; secondly, the oath that this Son should be high priest forever, after the order of Melchisedek, Ps. 110: 4. These two oaths it is impossible God should disregard; and the salvation of believers, therefore, is adequately and surely provided for.

In this opinion, I find that Storr for substance agrees.

On the other hand, to represent the promise and the oath to confirm the same, as the *two immutable things*, seems to be inapposite; for the writer here states, that what is sworn to, even among men, must be regarded as fixed or established. The more surely, what *God* has *once* solemnly declared can never be annulled. The *two* things, then, which are immutable, are the two different oaths, viz. that in Gen. 22: 15—18, and that in Ps. 110: 4; to which the writer had repeatedly adverted.

Ἰσχυρὰν παράκλησιν ἐλπίδος, we, who have sought a refuge, might have strong persuasion to hold fast the hope which is set before us. That is, God has made adequate provision for the salvation of all, who prove faithful to the cause of Christ; and he has secured it by oaths, made at different times, and on diverse occasions. The certainty, then, of obtaining the reward promised to fidelity, constitutes a powerful motive to persevere, for all those who have sought a refuge from the power and penalty of sin, in the religion of Jesus. *Παράκλησιν*, in the sense of *comfort, consolation*, is common in the New Testament; but according to the classical use of the word, it means, *excitement, exhortation, persuasion*, etc. This latter use of the word is common also to the New Testament writers; and in this sense I understand it, in the verse before us. *Consolation* is not so appropriate to the writer's object here, as *excitement, (Anregung*, Schneider), *persuasion.*

Ἰσχυράν means, *powerful*, i. e. having great force, proffering strong motives.

Οἱ καταφυγόντες, we who seek a refuge. Καταφεύγω means *to flee toward, to flee to, to flee under*, viz. a place of refuge, an asylum; which latter is generally designated after the verb. But here, *οἱ καταφυγόντες* seems to be employed as a periphrasis, in order to designate Christians who are seeking a refuge from sin and sorrow. In like manner *σωζομένους* is employed, in Acts 2: 47.

Κρατῆσαι, to hold fast, to take firm hold of, to grasp with tenacity, Hebrew חזק. *Ἐλπίδος, hope*, here means the objects of hope, i. e. the objects of Christian hope, for which Christians hope, or which they expect; just as *ἐπαγγελία* above means, *the objects promised, the things promised;* and so, often, in respect to many other words of a similar nature. *Προκειμένης, proposed, set forth*, is a word which was employed in respect to the *ἆθλον* or *prize of victory*, in the Grecian games. This was said *προκεῖσθαι, to be proposed* or *set before* the competitors. So, in our text, the *object of hope*, viz. future happiness and glory, deliverance from sin and sorrow, is *set before* all Christians, who are *καταφυγόντες, seeking a refuge* from their guilt and miseries. And the repeated oath of God assures them, that such a refuge is to be found, and also affords a powerful excitement to seek it.

19. *Ἣν ὡς ἄγκυραν βεβαίαν, which we have as an anchor of the soul unfailing and firmly fixed;* i. e. which hope we are in possession of, *ἔχομεν*, and it will prove to us, in our troubles and distresses, what an anchor of sound materials and firmly fixed will be to a ship in a tempest; i. e. it will keep us from "making shipwreck of the faith." Many commentators refer *ἣν* to *παράκλησιν*; but it seems to me quite contrary to the manifest object of the passage. *Hope* is often represented under the emblem of an anchor, among the heathen writers. *Ἀσφαλῆ* means, *that which will not fail*, i. e. like an anchor of good materials, which will not give way. *Βεβαίαν* means *firmly fixed*, i. e. having a tenacious hold, which cannot be slipped.

Καὶ εἰσερχομένην καταπετάσματος, and which enters into that within the vail, i. e. which *hope* enters into the inner sanctuary, the *sanctum sanctorum*, where God dwells. Others refer *εἰσερχομένην* to *ἄγκυραν*. The meaning, as I explain the passage, is, that the *objects of hope* are in heaven, where God dwells. The apartment within the vail of the temple at Jerusalem, was that in which the ark of the covenant was placed, and also the cherubim that shadowed the mercy seat. There the glory of God appeared. This inner sanctuary was an emblem of heaven; see Heb. 9: 1—11, 23. 10: 1. The phrase *ἐσώτερον τοῦ καταπετάσματος*, here designates an image of heaven.

The sentiment of the writer, then, is as follows. 'Hold fast the objects of your Christian hope. These will keep you steady

in adherence to your holy religion, and preserve you, like an anchor, from making shipwreck of the faith. These objects of hope are heavenly in their nature, *ἡ ἐλπὶς εἰσερχομένη εἰς τὸ ἐσώτερον τοῦ καταπετάσματος.* Consequently, these objects are immutable, and so *ἀσφαλεῖς καὶ βέβαιοι,* like a good anchor.'

Ὅπου πρόδρομος Ἰησοῦς, whither Jesus our precursor has gone, on our account. Πρόδρομος εἰσῆλθεν, I take to mean simply, that Jesus has *first* led the way into the heavenly sanctuary. So Aeschylus, Her. ad Theb. v. 217, *πρόδρομος ἦλθε,* i. q. *προῆλθε.* Theodoret makes an appropriate remark on this passage. "The writer designs to increase their confidence by calling Jesus *πρόδρομος;* for if he is their *precursor,* and has gone thither on their account, then ought Christians to follow after him, so as to attain the end of their course, Theod. in loc."

The expression in the latter part of v. 19, *εἰσερχομένη εἰς τὸ ἐσώτερον τοῦ καταπετάσματος,* seems to have been purposely chosen as a periphrasis of the heavenly sanctuary, in order to direct the minds of the Hebrews to the *priesthood* of Christ; of which the writer now proceeds to treat, after having suspended the consideration of it from chap. V. 11. to chap. VI. 19, in order to introduce matter of warning and encouragement. It was lawful for the high priest only to enter, through the vail, into the inner sanctuary. So Jesus, as high priest of the new dispensation, entered the eternal sanctuary above, making expiation of perpetual efficacy for sinners, Heb. 9. 11, 12, 22—26.

Having thus reproved them for the little progress which they had made in Christian knowledge, 5: 11—VI. 3; warned them against the dreadful consequences of abandoning the Christian religion, 6: 4—8; and encouraged them to hold fast their faith and hope even to the end, as they had the example of Abraham, and the oath of God to assure them of an adequate reward, 6: 9—19; the writer now returns to make the comparison of Christ as high priest, with Melchisedek, whose name in connexion with that of Christ, had been already more than once introduced, 5: 6, 10. This subject he pursues to the end of 7: 25; where he resumes the topic broken off at 5: 10, and completes what he had to say concerning it, 7: 26—28.

CHAP. VII.

1. *Οὗτος γὰρ Μελχιζεδέκ, now this Melchisedek*, i. e. the Melchisedek whom I have already named.

Βασιλεὺς Σαλήμ. Nearly all the Greek and Latin fathers held this place to be the same as *Jerusalem*. So Ps. 76: 2, [3]. "In *Salem* is his tabernacle." Comp. Gen. 14: 18. The *Σαλείμ*, mentioned in John 3: 23, was probably a different place from that which our text names; if indeed *Σαλήμ* is meant by our author, to designate a *place* at all. Is it not rather an appellative? See the writer's own interpretation, v. 2.

Ἱερεὺς τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ὑψίστου, Hebrew כֹּהֵן לְאֵל עֶלְיוֹן, Gen. 14: 18. It was common, among the ancients, for a king to be priest also; thus uniting the two highest honours among men, in his own person. The Jewish kings did not do thus, so long as the race of David was upon the throne; because the priesthood was confined to the tribe of Levi. But the Maccabees did it; Joseph. Antiq. XIII. 19, comp. Macc. in the Apocrypha. Among foreign nations, this was very common. In reference to this double honour, Peter calls Christians *βασίλειον ἱεράτευμα*, 1 Pet. 2: 9. and John, in Rev. 1: 6, says, that Christ has made for his followers a *βασιλείαν*, and constituted them *ἱερεῖς τῷ θεῷ*.

How highly the Jews of the apostle's day estimated the *honour* of priesthood, may be seen from Philo; who says, "The law of kingly office applies to priests *εἰς σεμνότητα καὶ τιμήν, in regard to dignity and honour*, de Legat. ad Caium, p. 832." In the same book, he represents the Jewish people as regarding "the high priesthood to be as much above the kingly office, as God is more exalted than men." All this serves to shew, that the apostle, by exhibiting and proving the priesthood of Christ, not only pointed out the way in which pardon of sin had been effected, but also

contributed much towards causing the Messiah to be honoured, in the view of the Hebrews.

In calling Melchisedek *a priest of the most high God*, the Scripture designs to exhibit him as a true priest of the true God, maker and lord of heaven and earth, Gen. 14: 19, 22.

Ὁ συναντήσας εὐλογήσας αὐτόν, who met Abraham returning from the slaughter of the [confederate] *kings, and blessed him;* see Gen. 14: 17—20.

2. *Ὡι καὶ δεκάτην Ἀβραάμ, to whom also, Abraham gave a tenth part of all*, viz. a tenth *ἀπὸ πάντων τῶν ἀκροθινίων, of all the spoils* (see v. 4), which he had taken from the confederate kings whom he had discomfited, Gen. 14: 14—16, 20. *Δεκάτην* agrees with *μοῖραν* understood.

Πρῶτον μὲν ἑρμενευόμενος, βασιλεὺς δικαιοσύνης, by interpretation, [his name] *means, first, righteous king. Βασιλεὺς δικαιοσύνης* resembles the formulas, *God of mercy, God of glory*, etc. instead of *merciful God, glorious God*, etc; which are common indeed in all languages, but more especially in the Hebrew. In fact, the sense put upon *βασιλεὺς δικαιοσύνης*, in the translation, is the only one that can be put upon it; for what is a *king of righteousness*, in any other sense? The phrase, king of a nation or people, or of living beings, we understand; but what a king of an *abstract* existence is, which belongs solely to *mental* conception, it would be difficult to understand.

Ἔπειτα δὲ καὶ βασιλεὺς εἰρήνης, and then he is king of Salem, which means, king of peace.

3. *Ἀπάτωρ, ἀμήτωρ, having neither father nor mother*, i. e. recorded in the sacred genealogies; or, perhaps, whose father and mother were not of kingly rank. These words were applied *literally*, by the Greeks, to some of their gods; then *figuratively*, to those who were orphans, and to those whose parents were obscure and of low origin. Thus Livy, IV. 3, "nullo patre natus," respecting a person of ignoble descent. So Horace, Serm. I. 6, 10, "nullis majoribus natos." Philo calls Sarah, *ἀμήτορα*, probably because her mother is not mentioned in the sacred records. And in such a sense, the apostle appears to call Melchisedek, *ἀπάτωρ* and *ἀμήτωρ*. The explanation of these terms is to be found, (as one will easily believe), in the word *ἀγενεαλόγητος, without any genealogy*, viz. of whose genealogy no mention is made in Scripture.

The Arabians say, of a man who has by his own efforts procured an exalted place of honour, and who is decended from ignoble parents, لَا أَبَا لَهُ, *he has no father*, i. e. he is not named from his father, or derives not his titles and honours from his father. Michaelis prefers the explanation which this idiom would afford, in respect to the passage under examination. But the other seems preferable, on account of the explanation which the writer himself has made, by adding, *ἀγενεαλόγητος*. See Schleusner and Wahl, on *ἀπάτωρ* and *ἀμήτωρ*.

Μήτε ἀρχὴν ἔχων, having neither beginning of days nor end of life, i. e. either, 'Whose time of birth or death is not related:' or rather, 'Who, as high priest, has no limited time assigned for the commencement and expiration of his office:' for so the following clause leads us to interpret this expression. The Levitical priests were limited in their service; see Num. 4: 3, 23, 35, 43, 47, (comp. Num. 8: 24, 25). *Ζωῆς*, according to the latter mode of interpretation, refers to the life of Melchisedek as priest, i. e. the time of his priesthood. *Ζωή* is often equivalent in sense to *καιρὸς ζωῆς*, the season or time which one lives. The meaning of the writer then is, that Melchisedek's priesthood was limited to no definite time, i. e. he was *sacerdos perpetuus*, a priest without limitation of office. So the Latins say, *Dictator perpetuus*, etc.

Ἀφωμοιωμένος δὲ διηνεκὲς, being like to the Son of God, remaineth a priest perpetually. The sacred writer, in Ps. 110: 4, says of the Messiah, that he is כֹּהֵן לְעוֹלָם, Sept. *ἱερεὺς εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα*, i. q. *εἰς τὸ διηνεκὲς*; and then adds, "after the order of Melchisedek." First, then, Christ is asserted by the Psalmist to be a *perpetual* priest; and next, to confirm or explain this assertion, it is added, that he is so according to the order of Melchisedek. The implication is, of course, that Melchisedek is *perpetual* priest; for this is a special point of the comparison. The apostle means to say, in our text, that inasmuch as Melchisedek is understood to have a perpetual priesthood, and since the priesthood of the Son of God is affirmed, in the 110th Psalm, to be like his; so it follows, course, that the priesthood of Christ is understood to be perpetual, or that Melchisedek in regard to his priesthood, was like to, or could be compared with, the Son of God.

In respect to the object of this assertion, I apprehend nothing

more is intended, than that the priesthood of Christ and of Melchisedek was not, like that of the sons of Aaron, limited to any *definite* period. In the *absolute* sense, εἰς τὸ διηνεκές clearly is not to be understood. Melchisedek's priesthood terminated with his life; so Christ's priestly and kingly office both will cease, when the work of redemption is fully accomplished, 1 Cor. 15: 24—28. But in neither case is there any statute, which limits the specific time of accession to office, and of egress from it. Of course, the order of Christ's priesthood, and that of Melchisedek, differed greatly in this respect from that of the sons of Aaron, and was, as the writer goes on to declare, greatly superior to it. *Dictator perpetuus* among the Romans, for example, was surely a higher, or at least a more honorable office, than that of ordinary Dictator.

Our English version of ἀφομοιωμένος, *made like to*, does not seem to give the true sense of the passage. The apostle is not labouring to shew that Melchisedek, in respect to his priesthood, was *made like to* Christ; but vice versa. He is seeking to illustrate and establish the perpetuity of Christ's priesthood, by comparing it with the well known priesthood of Melchisedek. Hence, to say that Melchisedek was *made like to the Son of God*, is a ὕστερον πρότερον; for Ps. 110: 4, compares the Son of God as priest, to Melchisedek. This too is the order of nature and propriety; for the priesthood of Melchisedek *preceded* that of Christ; it was something with which the Hebrews were already acquainted, inasmuch as their Scriptures had repeatedly spoken of it. Of course, the apostle, in aiming to illustrate and establish the priesthood of Christ, (a priesthood that was recent and not well understood by the Hebrews), would very naturally pursue the method of comparison offered to his view in Ps. 110: 4, i. e. a comparison of Christ's priesthood to that of Melchisedek. Ἀφομοιωμένος means, then, not *made like to*, but *like to*, possibly, *likened to*, i. e. *being compared to*.

The whole passage, from ὁ συναντήσας in v. 1, to τῷ υἱῷ τοῦ θεοῦ in v. 3, is plainly a *parenthetic* explanation, (a very common occurrence in the writings of Paul), thrown in for the sake of suggesting to the reader's mind some considerations respecting the character and dignity of Melchisedek, which would be very useful, in regard to a right understanding of the comparison that was to be made out in the sequel. Οὗτος γὰρ ὁ Μελχισέδεκ, etc. in v. 1, is

the immediate nominative to *μένει ἱερεὺς εἰς τὸ διηνεκές*, in v. 3. The construction of the whole sentence is thus; 'This Melchisedek, king of Salem, priest (who met Abraham and blessed him whose name means, first, *righteous king*, and secondly, *peaceful king* of a descent no where recorded, having a priestly office not limited, and being in respect to his priesthood like to the Son of God), is a perpetual priest.' If it be objected, that the participles *ἑρμενευόμενος*, *ἔχων* and *ἀφομοιωμένος* have not, like *συναντήσας*, the article before them, and therefore cannot be arranged in such a construction; the answer is, that nouns, participles, and adjectives, put in *apposition*, either take or omit the article, at the pleasure of the writer. E. g. v. 1, *ὁ Μελχισεδὲκ—βασιλεὺς ἱερεύς*, in apposition. Then *ὁ συναντήσας εὐλογήσας ἑρμενευόμενος ἀπάτωρ, ἀμήτωρ, ἀγενεαλόγητος ... ἔχων ... ἀφομοιωμένος*—all in apposition with *ὁ συναντήσας*; a mode of using adjectives and participles by no means unusual. See Gersdorf, Beiträge etc. Th. V. Ueber die Stellung der Adjectiven, etc. In the translation, I have, for the sake of perspicuity, broken up the involved construction of the original, and made several simple sentences. See Excursus XIII.

4. *Θεωρεῖτε δὲ πατριάρχης, consider now how great a personage this must be, to whom the patriarch Abraham gave a tithe of the spoils. Θεωρεῖτε, see, perceive, consider. Πηλίκος, of what exalted rank. Ἀκροθινίων*, in its literal sense, means, *summitas acervi frumenti, the top part of a heap of grain.* It was usual to offer the *primitiae* or *first fruits* to God. But as offerings were made to their gods, by the Greeks, from spoils taken in war, *ἀκροθίνια* came at last to signify, in the Greek language, *any kind of spoils*, from which an offering for the gods was taken. The Latins called such offerings, *manubiae*. The word *ἀκροθινίων* has the *general* sense of *spoils* here, and evidently refers to the spoils which Abraham had taken from the confederate kings, Gen. 14: 16.

The object of the apostle, in mentioning the circumstance here adverted to, plainly is, to exalt the dignity of Melchisedek. The high reverence which the Jews had for Abraham is well known. If now it could be shewn to the Hebrews, that Melchisedek was superior to Abraham, then the superiority of Christ, who is like to Melchisedek, is also shewn. Moreover, since the patriarch or head of a nation was reckoned, in the East, as excelling in dignity all

his descendants; so, if Melchisedek's dignity exceeded that of Abraham, it would follow, that it exceeded that of all his descendants—among whom were the Levitical priests. It is for the sake of establishing this last point, that the comparison of Melchisedek with Abraham is introduced in v. 4; as the sequel plainly shews. This being established, it would follow, that Christ's priesthood, (which was like that of Melchisedek), was superior to the Aaronical priesthood; which is the point that the writer designs to illustrate and establish.

5. *Καὶ οἱ μὲν λαμβάνοντες, moreover, the sons of Levi, who obtain* the *office of the priesthood*, i. e. who are constituted priests. *All* the sons of Levi were not properly priests; but only the descendants of Aaron. Hence, the writer adds, *τὴν ἱερατείαν λαμβάνοντες*. It was true, indeed, that the whole tribe of Levi had a right to tithes; Num. 18: 26—30. Deut. 14: 22, 27—29. But it is not material to the writer's object here, to mention this. He is concerned merely with the *priests*; who, as descendants of Levi, were of course entitled to tithes. If he could shew that the priests, the most honoured part of the Levites, who were legally entitled to receive tithes from the other descendants of Abraham, were still inferior to Melchisedek; then would he shew that the priesthood of Christ was of an order superior to theirs. The payment of tithes is an acknowledgment of superiority, in regard to the rank of the person who receives them. If Abraham, then, paid tithes to Melchisedek, he acknowledged him as superior in respect to rank.

Ἐντολὴν ἔχουσιν νόμον, have, by the law, a commission to tithe the people. See the passages of the law, just referred to. *Ἐντολήν, direction, mandate*, a *precept* that gives liberty or confers a right to do any thing.

Τοῦτ' ἔστι Ἀβραάμ, that is, their own brethren, although descendants from Abraham. *Ἐξεληλυθότας ἐκ τῆς ὀσφύος*, a Hebraistic mode of expression; e. g. Gen. 35: 11, *kings* מֶלָכִים יֵצְאוּ; Gen. 46: 26, יֹצְאֵי יֶרֶךְ, Ex. 1: 5, et al. The Greeks used *γεννᾶσθαι ὑπό τινος*, in such cases. The meaning of the passage is, the priests of the tribe of Levi, although descended in common with the other tribes from Abraham, yet have been elevated to a rank above them, and receive the tribute of *acknowledged elevation*, in the tithes which are paid them by the others.

But why should the elevation of the priests above their brethren, be introduced here? I answer, in order to shew that the most honoured part of the sons of Levi, the most honoured tribe, were of a rank inferior to Melchisedek; consequently, their priesthood was of an order inferior to that of Christ.

6. *Ὁ δὲ μὴ γενεαλογούμενος ἐξ αὐτῶν, but he whose descent is not reckoned from them;* a periphrasis, by which Melchisedek is described, and, at the same time, additional intimation is given, that he was of an order of priests different from that of the Levites.

Δεδεκάτωκε εὐλόγηκε, tithed [received tithes from] *Abraham, and blessed him to whom the promises were made.* *Δεδεκάτωκε* is a Hellenistic word, being found only in the Septuagint and New Testament. The meaning is, that Melchisedek received from Abraham a *tenth* of the spoils; which was the same ratio with the tithes received by the Levitical priesthood. *Καὶ τὸν ἔχοντα τὰς ἐπαγγελίας εὐλόγηκε,* a periphrasis designating Abraham, to whom God had made promises of great blessings; comp. Heb. 6: 12—15.

7. *Χωρὶς δὲ πάσης εὐλογεῖται, and beyond all controversy, the inferior was blessed by the superior.* *Ἀντιλογίας, gainsaying, dispute, doubt,* comp. 6: 16. *Ἔλαττον* here means merely *inferiority in point of rank, office,* or *station;* not inferiority in regard to moral or religious character, which it is not the writer's object to bring into view, as it is not to his present purpose. Melchisedek was both king and priest; Abraham was neither; at least he is not called by either appellation. He was, indeed, an *Emir,* i. e. the head of a company of migratory shepherds (Nomades), and had a large number of dependants; as may be seen in Gen. 14: 14. Abraham is also called נָבִיא, *prophet,* Gen. 20: 7; but he is not called כֹּהֵן, although he repeatedly offered sacrifices; nor do the Scriptures call him מֶלֶךְ, *king.*

Κρείττονος is the antithesis or correlate of *ἔλαττον,* and therefore means, *superior.* Both adjectives are of the *neuter* gender, as is manifest from *ἔλαττον*; but this gender in adjectives is employed to denote *abstract quality,* i. e. it is used in the same way as abstract nouns; which are very frequently employed, by the sacred writers, instead of concrete ones. E. g. Christ is the *way,* the *truth,* and *life,* i. e. he is the guide, the instructer, and the author of life, to men. So here, the literal rendering would be, *infe-*

riority is blessed by superiority, i. e. the inferior person is blessed by the superior one.

The apostle takes this as a position which will be granted by the Hebrews, from the simple consideration, that Abraham, by paying tithes to Melchisedek, of course acknowledged his own inferior rank.

8. *Καὶ ὧδε μὲν . . . λαμβάνουσι, here, also, men receive tithes who die; but there, one of whom it is testified that he lives* A very difficult verse, about which there has been no small controversy. The *literal* sense of the words would make nothing for the writer's purpose. Of the *natural* life of men he is not speaking; but of the duration of the priestly office. Ὧδε means, *in respect to the Levites*; ἐκεῖ, *in regard to Melchisedek*. Ὧδε and ἐκεῖ may also be literally rendered, in *this place*, and, in *that place*; which gives the meaning just proposed. But what is ἀποθνήσκοντες? Is it the *natural* death of the body? But, in this respect, the Levites differed not from the king of Salem; both were mortals. In another world, too, they live as well as he, i. e. both are immortal also. Ζῇ, therefore, cannot refer simply to living in another world. Nor is there any ground for supposing the apostle means to assert, that Melchisedek's high priesthood continues in heaven; as some have imagined. There is no intimation in Scripture of any such thing, in regard to any one but Jesus. I must therefore understand ἀποθνήσκοντες as being used figuratively here, in order to denote the *brief* and *mutable* condition of the Levitical priesthood. The figurative use of θνήσκω and ἀποθνήσκω, in the New Testament, is very common; although no instance occurs, perhaps, where it has the same shade of meaning, which it appears to have here. Schleusner, however, gives to θνήσκω, in 1 Tim. 5: 6, the same sense, viz. *qui officio suo non fungitur*. But in the verse before us, he construes ἀποθνήσκοντες as meaning, *mortales*, and ζῇ as applying to *Christ*, not to Melchisedek;—most plainly against the context that follows.

The word ζῇ seems to me, plainly, not to mean here, either *natural life*, or *future immortality*, but an enduring, unlimited time of priesthood; and to designate the same idea as μένει ἱερεὺς εἰς τὸ διηνεκές, in v. 3. A sense like this, viz. that of *duration, perennitas*, the word ζάω often has. If this be correct, then its correlate, ἀποθνήσκοντες, must of course have the sense of, *short lived*, or,

deceasing, viz. as to office, or the priesthood. In this way, and in this only, can I make out any tolerable sense of the passage, consistently with the context. Nothing can be plainer, than that the object of the writer is to shew the perpetuity of Melchisedek's priesthood, and not that of his *natural* life; and by consequence, he would also make out the perpetuity of Christ's priesthood. To construe *ἀποθνήσκοντες*, then, as referring to *physical* mortality, and *ζῇ* as having respect to *physical* or *natural* life, is to quit the subject under the consideration of the writer, and resort to one which is altogether inapposite to his purpose. That *ζάω* and *ζωή*, moreover, often denote *perpetuity*, *perennitas*, the reader may readily see by consulting Wahl's Lex. *ζάω*, no. 2. *β*, and *ζωή*, no. 1. *γ*. The word *ἀποθνήσκοντες*, then, by the force of *antithesis*, denotes the reverse of this; and *perennity*, here, is not ascribed to *natural life*, but to the *priesthood*.

9. *Καὶ, ὡς ἔπος εἰπεῖν δεδεκάτωται, yea, even Levi, who receives tithes, was (if I may be allowed the expression) himself tithed, through Abraham.* Ὡς ἔπος εἰπεῖν is very common, in the best Greek writers. It is a *μείλιγμα*, *softening down*, of an expression, which a writer supposes his readers may deem to be too strong, or which may have the appearance of excess or severity. It amounts to an indirect apology, for employing an unusual or unexpected assertion or phrase. It is very happily introduced here; as the subject itself is one which the writer did not intend to urge as capable of being scanned with metaphysical exactness, but only as bearing a popular mode of explanation.

Καὶ, verily, truly, imo, vero, profecto; see Wahl, Lex. *καί*, 2. b. *β*. Brettschneider, Lex. *καί*. 5. 6.

10. *Ἔτι γὰρ ἐν τῇ ὀσφύϊ Μελχισεδέκ, for he was then in the loins of his father, when Melchisedek met him.* Ἔτι. *etiam nunc, even now, already*, or, *etiam tunc, even then, then*. The meaning of the writer is, that at the time then present, viz. when Melchisedek met Abraham, Levi was *ἐν τῇ ὀσφύϊ τοῦ πατρός*. Our English version, "He was yet in the loins of his father," gives a sense quite different from that of the writer; for the meaning of this must be, 'he was yet to be begotten,' i. e. he was not yet born. But the apostle designs to say, and it is appropriate to his object to say, that even then, when Melchisedek met Abraham, Levi already (in a certain sense) existed, and, through Abraham, paid tithes to the

king of Salem, i. e. acknowledged inferiority compared with him. This is the very point, which the writer is labouring to illustrate. See Excursus XIV.

11. *Εἰ μὲν οὖν τελείωσις ἦν, further, if perfection were* [attainable] *by the Levitical priesthood. Μὲν οὖν*, or *μενοῦν, moreover, further. Μὲν οὖν* are often used as a continuative particle, merely indicating that the writer is advancing to another topic or paragraph. *Οὖν* is illative, in a general way; but when joined with *μέν*, it should not, usually, be separately translated. That a new topic is begun here, will be plain to every considerate reader.

Τελείωσις, a word very variously understood and translated. Some render it, *accomplishment*, viz. of the design of the priesthood; others, *sanctification*; others, *consummate happiness*; others, *moral rectitude* or *perfection*. It is best explained by a reference to corresponding passages in the sequel. In 9: 9, it is said, that 'the Levitical sacrifices could not *τελειῶσαι* the person who offered them;' which (if we compare 9: 14) appears plainly to mean, 'to take away the burden of guilt, and to render pure or holy the minds of worshippers.' Again, in 10: 1, it is affirmed of the sacrifices, that 'they could not *τελειῶσαι* those who approached the altar,' i. e. those who offered them; and by comparing 10: 2—4 with this, it is plain the writer means to say, that 'the sacrifices could not bestow peace of conscience—could not take away the burden of sin from the mind of the worshipper; but they left him filled with apprehensions, that the penalty of the divine law might still be executed upon him.' Here then is plainly the *τελείωσις*, which the Levitical priesthood could not effect. It could neither purify the mind or soul of the worshipper, nor free him from the burden of his sins, or from the apprehension that they might be punished. Christ did both; and this is the *τελείωσις* here spoken of, which he accomplished, and which the law could not accomplish. Chap. 10: 3, 14, is very direct to this purpose. The writer, then, has explained *τελείωσις*, by the sequel of his epistle; and in a manner altogether accordant with the object of his reasoning here.

Ὁ λαὸς γὰρ ἐπ' αὐτῇ νενομοθέτητο, (for the people received the law in connexion with this). This circumstance is evidently to be placed in a parenthesis. *Νενομοθέτητο*, *were subjected to the law, were put under the law.* Such a construction in the pas-

sive voice is peculiar; comp. Rom. 3: 4. *Ἐπ' αὐτῇ, on this condition, connected with this,* or, *under these circumstances;* comp. Wahl on *ἐπί*, II. 4. b. The meaning is, that the Levitical priesthood and the Mosaic law are closely and inseparably linked together, so that if one is changed, the other must of necessity be; as the writer proceeds to shew in the sequel.

Τίς ἔτι χρεία λέγεσθαι, what need was there, any more, that another priest should arise after the order of Melchisedek, and not be called after the order of Aaron. That is, 'if the Levitical priesthood, and the law connected with it, accomplished all, in respect to purification from sin and the giving of quiet to the conscience, which was needed, then why should the Psalmist speak of a priest, who was of an order different from that of Aaron, and who was yet to arise?' This would be unnecessary, if the priesthood of Aaron were adequate to the great purposes of salvation. *Ἔτι, any more, any longer.*

12. *Μετατιθεμένης γὰρ γίνεται, but in case the priesthood is changed, there must needs be also a change of the law. Μετατίθημι* means, *to transfer, to translate.* This sense corresponds sufficiently well with the intention of the writer, whose design is to shew, that the priesthood of the ancient dispensation had been *transferred* to Christ, although on conditions very different from those formerly attached to it; and that Christ not only was a priest in fact, but that his priesthood, coming in the place of the other ancient priesthood, superseded it. *Νόμου* here means, the Jewish dispensation, the Mosaic law. The change spoken of in respect to this, has reference to the fact, that all its ritual observances and its priesthood, (which were inseparably connected), must be laid aside together, under the new dispensation. As Christ's priesthood differed from that of the Levites, so must the law, by which it is regulated, differ from that which regulated the Aaronical priesthood.

This conclusion is in itself so obvious, that the writer does not deem it necessary to produce any formal arguments here to establish it. He proceeds to shew, that the priesthood itself is changed, by adducing facts and declarations recorded in the Old Testament. (1) Christ sprang from the tribe of Judah, vs. 13, 14. (2) He was to be a priest of the order of Melchisedek, vs. 15—17.

Consequently, the law, which was necessarily connected with the Levitical priesthood, must also be changed.

13. *Ἐφ ὃν γὰρ θυσιαστηρίῳ, now he, concerning whom these things are said, belonged to a different tribe, none of whom served at the altar.* Γάρ here connects the illustration or proof, with the proposition in v. 12. It may, however, be translated, *but*, with nearly the same effect. The reasoning then would stand thus, 'If the priesthood be changed, the law must also be changed; but the priesthood is changed, [i. e. Christ, who is appointed to the priesthood, sprung from the tribe of Judah]; therefore, the law is laid aside; comp. v. 18. and seq.

Προσέσχηκε. Προσέχω means, *to give heed, to apply the mind to, τὸν νοῦν* being understood; also, *to give one's care to, to serve.*

14. *Πρόδηλον γὰρ ἐλάλησε, for it is quite manifest, that our Lord sprang from Judah, in respect to which tribe, Moses said nothing concerning the priesthood*, i. e. he gave the priest's office to the sons of Levi, Num. 18: 6, and not to the tribe of Judah. The reader is left to supply, at the end of the verse, the conclusion of the syllogism, (which Paul very frequently omits), viz. *μετατίθεται οὖν ἡ ἱερωσύνη, consequently the priesthood is changed*; i. e. since Christ is high priest, who was of the tribe of Judah, it follows, of course, that there must be a change in the priesthood; for none but Levites, under the ancient dispensation, could be priests.

15. *Καὶ περισσότερον ἔτι ἕτερος, and still more evident is it*, [viz. that the priesthood must be changed], *if another priest has arisen, like to Melchisedek.* Between *δῆλον, πρόδηλον*, and *κατάδηλον*, there is no important difference of signification. The two latter seem naturally to render the word somewhat more intensive. *Ἀνίσταται, is risen up*, viz. the high priest in question, *has already arisen* or made his appearance, *is already extant.*

Καθ' ὁμοιότητα, according to the likeness, in the similitude, i. e. like, resembling; in a sense like that of *κατὰ τάξιν*, in 5: 6, 10. 6: 20. 7: 11, Hebrew, עַל דִּבְרָתִי, Ps. 110: 4. Comp. *ἀφωμοιωμένος* in 7: 3.

16. *Ὃς οὐ κατὰ νόμον ἀκαταλύτου, who was not made* [a priest] *by an ordinance of temporary obligation, but by an authority of endless duration*; i. e. he was not made a priest, under the Mosaic law which was to be set aside, vs. 12, 18 seq.; but by the oath of God, which is immutable, comp. vs. 20—24 and 28.

Σαρκικῆς, fleshly; hence, secondarily, *frail, infirm, short lived, temporary, quicquid caducum.* So the Hebrew בָּשָׂר, Gen. 6: 3. Ps. 56: 5. 78: 39. Job 10: 4. Is. 31: 3; comp. also *ἀσθενές* and *ἀνωφελές* in v. 18. *Ἐντολῆς* means here, the *precept* or *command* respecting the appointment of priests, contained in the *νόμος*, i. e. Mosaic law. *Ἐντολῆς σαρκικῆς* is, then, *preceptum caducum, a temporary command, an obligation of a temporary, perishable nature.* So vs. 12 and 18 require us to interpret the passage.

Δύναμιν, authority, authoritative appointment. So Acts 4: 7 *ἐν ποίᾳ δυνάμει; by what authority?* see also 1 Cor. 5: 4. *Ζωῆς, perennitas, perpetuity;* see on v. 8. above. *Ἀκαταλύτου, quod destrui nequit, indissoluble,* hence, *immutable, imperishable, perpetual.* As it is the antithesis of *σαρκικῆς*, the meaning of *σαρκικῆς* must be that which is given above.

That this interpretation of the whole verse is well grounded, follows plainly from the succeeding verse, (v. 17), which is adduced simply to prove the *perpetuity* of Christ's priesthood.

17. *Μαρτυρεῖ γάρ*, viz. *ἡ γραφή*, or *τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον.* The nominative, in such cases, would of course be supplied by the readers of the epistle. In the writings of the Mishnical doctors, the usual mode of appeal to the Scriptures is, שֶׁנֶּאֱמַר, i. e. *quod dicitur*, or, *λέγεται γάρ, μαρτυρεῖται.* The writer makes the appeal to Scripture, in this case, to confirm and enforce what he had just asserted.

The conclusion is now left, for the reader to supply. In v. 11, the writer had said, that the Levitical priesthood, and the system of law under which the people of Israel had been placed, were connected together. In v. 12, he intimates that the connexion was so intimate, that whatever affected one would affect the other; and consequently, that if the priesthood be changed, the law itself must be. 'But the priesthood is changed,' is the next proposition which he establishes, vs. 13—17. It follows, therefore, (and this is the conclusion which the reader is now to supply), that the law is also changed.

The writer proceeds to give another reason why the ancient law must be repealed, or rather be superseded. One reason just given above is, that the priesthood is changed, which demands a corresponding change of the law. Another reason now to be giv-

en, is the inefficacy of the whole legal institution, in respect to spiritual pardon and sanctification.

18. *Ἀθέτησις μὲν γὰρ ἀνωφελές, There is, moreover, a setting aside of the preceding law, because it was inefficient and unavailing. Μὲν γάρ*, continuative (as often), *further, also, moreover, besides;* the transition being made to another argument, and *μὲν γάρ* shewing that the subject is continued, and something more added to it. *Ἀθέτησις, rejection, setting aside, abrogation;* a stronger word than *ἀναλλαγή. Προαγούσης,* literally *preceding,* i. e. going before the Christian dispensation, i. q. the ancient law. *Ἀσθενὲς καὶ ἀνωφελές* are words of nearly the same import here. *Ἀσθενές* is said of that which has not *power* to accomplish any particular end proposed; and *ἀνωφελές* is said of that, which proves to be neither useful nor availing, for the purpose to which it has been applied. The meaning here is, that the ancient law, with all its ritual, had proved to be altogether incompetent to effect the *τελείωσις* mentioned in v. 11th, i. e. the purification of the sinner, and that peace of conscience which is inspired by the well grounded hope of pardon for sin; comp. v. 19. and 9: 9, 14. 10: 1—4. The two words *ἀσθενές* and *ἀνωφελές* increase the intensity of the affirmation. The epithet *σαρκικῆς*, in v. 16, is of a similar nature.

19. *Οὐδὲν γὰρ ἐτελείωσεν ὁ νόμος, for the law perfected nothing. Οὐδέν*, neuter gender, is used here for *οὐδένα* masculine, i. e. *no one;* just as *τὸ ἔλαττον*, in v. 2, means the *superior person*, i. e. Melchisedek. *Τὸ πάν* and *πάντα* are repeatedly used, by John, for *πᾶς* and *πάντες*; and so of other adjectives. *Ἐτελείωσε* means, *did not effect a τελείωσις, did not purify and pacify the consciences and minds of sinners.* We have no one English word, which corresponds at all with the force of the Greek original; and we must therefore content ourselves, either with a kind of literal rendering of it, or with a periphrasis, leaving the explanation for notes.

Ἐπεισαγωγὴ δὲ τῷ θεῷ, but the introduction of a better hope [does]. *Ἐτελείωσε* is implied after *ἐλπίδος*, by the laws of grammar. *The introduction of a better hope does perfect men*, i. e. it inspires them with well grounded hope of pardon, and "purifies their consciences from dead works, so that they may serve the living God, 9: 14." *Ἐπεισαγωγή, superinduction*, is said of one thing which is introduced in the place of another; e. g. in this

case, of the gospel, which was superinduced upon the Mosaic law. Ἐλπὶς κρείττων means, *a better source or ground of hope*, viz. the gospel was a better ground of hope to the sinner than the law. Δι' ἧς, *by which, by means of which, through which*, i. e. in the way disclosed by the gospel, ἐγγίζομεν τῷ θεῷ, *we draw nigh to God, we have access to God.* Under the ancient law, the high priest only entered the holy of holies, to procure pardon for the people. Under the gospel, the way is opened by Jesus, for all penitent sinners to "come boldly to the throne of grace," 4: 16, in order to obtain the blessings which they need. Ἐγγίζω is frequently construed with the dative, in Hellenistic Greek; see Winer's Gram. § 24. 4. Sept. Gen. 27: 21. Ex. 19: 22.

20. Καὶ καθ' ὅσον οὐ χωρὶς ὁρκωμοσίας, *further, since not without an oath*, supply ἱερεὺς γέγονεν Ἰησοῦς from the latter part of the following phrase, which is the antithesis of this. Καθ' ὅσον, in this case, refers to κατὰ τοσοῦτον in v. 22; and the intervening phrases are added by the writer, only by way of explanation and comparison. It is difficult, if not impossible, to give the exact features of the original here, in any copy. The argument of the writer stands thus; 'The gospel is a *better* source of hope; for, *as much* (καθ' ὅσον) as the appointment of a priest, by an oath, exceeds, in solemnity and importance, an arrangement to take the office merely by descent, *so much* (κατὰ τοσοῦτον, v. 22) does the new covenant, of which Jesus is the sponsor, exceed the old.' Ὁρκωμοσία does not differ in meaning from ὅρκος, unless it be, that the former applies rather to the *act* of taking an oath, being derived from ὅρκος and ὄμνυμι.

21. Οἱ μὲν ... γεγονότες, *for they*, i. e. the Levites, *became priests without an oath.* Μὲν γάρ, often means, *indeed, in fact, verily;* but here μέν is only the sign of *protasis.* The Levites were priests in consequence of being the descendants of Aaron; Jesus became a priest only by special appointment, sanctioned by an oath; as follows.

Ὁ δὲ μετὰ ὁρκωμοσίας ... Μελχιζεδέκ, *but he* [Jesus, became a priest] *with an oath, by him who said to him, "The Lord hath sworn, and will not repent; Thou art a priest for ever, of the order of Melchisedek*, Ps. 110: 4." Μεταμεληθήσεται signifies, *to regret, to alter one's mind or purpose through regret;* and simply, *to change or alter one's purpose.*

22. *Κατὰ τοσοῦτον Ἰησοῦς, Jesus is the surety of a covenant so much the better.* On *κατὰ τοσοῦτον*, see above. *Διαθήκη* (בְּרִית) means, *covenant, promise, disposition, arrangement, testament;* consequently, when applied to the ancient Jewish law, or to Christianity, it means *dispensation, economy. Κρείττονος* means, *better* than the ancient *διαθήκη*; i. e. the hope inspired by the new *διαθήκη* is as much better than the ancient *διαθήκη* could inspire, as the new *διαθήκη* is superior to the old. *Ἔγγυος, sponsor, pledge, surety.* Many critics have supposed, that this word is chosen here, on account of its likeness to *ἐγγίζομεν* in the 19th verse; so that it constitutes a kind of *παρονομασία* with it. However this may be, the word is altogether appropriate to the writer's purpose. He had spoken of a *better hope*, in v. 19. It was natural to ask, What is the ground or security, that this hope would be realized? This is answered by the assurance, that Jesus is *ἔγγυος* for the dispensation which supports it.

The writer now proceeds to add another reason, why the Levitical priesthood must be considered as far inferior to that of Jesus. As men in a frail and dying state are constituted priests, under the Levitical law, the consequence is, that the priesthood is liable to continual change, and must necessarily pass from the hands of one to another, in a short time. Not so, in the case of Christ; who, being exalted above the heavens, and constituted high priest in the temple not made with hands, hath an immutable priesthood, subject to no succession.

23. *Καὶ οἱ μὲν πλείονες παραμένειν, again, those priests,* viz. descendants of Aaron, *are many, since by reason of death they cannot be permanent. Πλείονες* refers to numbers constituted by repeated *succession;* not to the number of priests existing at any one time. *Θανάτῳ* is put in the dative, as signifying the *means.* The writer doubtless intends, that the comparison here shall be referred to the high priest's office in particular; for he is all along considering Jesus as *ἀρχιερεύς.* The number of priests, in general, is stated by Josephus to have been 1500. Contra Apion. I. 22.

24. *Ὁ δὲ, διὰ τὸ μένειν ἱερωσύνην, but he, because he continues* [a priest] *forever, has a priesthood without succession.* That *μένειν* here refers to priesthood, and not to simple duration of life, seems to me quite clear, from comparing vs. 3 (ad finem), 17, and

21. The very object of the writer is, to shew the difference between the order of Christ's priesthood and that of the Levites. To say that Christ lives forever, in the world above, is to say no more than what is equally true of the sons of Aaron, who surely are immortal beings. But to say that he continues a perpetual priest, and that his office is therefore subject to no transfer and succession like theirs, is saying what is altogether adapted to the writer's purpose, and perfectly accords with the assertions in the verses to which a reference has just been made. The reasoning stands thus. Jehovah has, by an oath, constituted the Messiah *ἱερέα εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα*; and because he is thus constituted perpetual priest, his priesthood has not, like that of Aaron, any succession in office.

Ἀπαράβατον is altogether an appropriate word here, and more significant than *αἰώνιον* or *ἀτέλευτον* would be. The writer had just said, 'The Levitical priesthood admits or demands many (*πλείονες*) priests in succession, because death is continually removing them from office.' On the contrary, Christ being appointed to a perpetual priesthood, his office is here declared to be *ἀπαράβατος*, i. e. it demands or admits no transition to another, no successor in his place. *Παραβαίνω* means, *to pass over, to pass on*; and when spoken of an office, it signifies, *to pass into the hands of another person*. *Ἀπαράβατος* is, therefore, *incapable of transition*; which is the very shade of meaning, that the writer's argument demands. So Theophylact and Oecumenius; *ἀπαράβατον, ἀδιάδοχον, without succession.*

25. *Ὅθεν καὶ σώζειν θεῷ, hence, also, he is able always to save those, who draw nigh to God through him*, i. e. approach the throne of grace (4: 16) in his name, or on his account, trusting in him as their priest and intercessor. *Ὅθεν, whence*, i. e. because he is a perpetual priest. *Σώζειν, to save*, means here, *to deliver from condemnation and punishment.* This the high priest did, in regard to God's external government over the Jews, when he went into the most holy place, and made expiation for the sins of the people. Christ, as a priest in the heavenly world, is able to do this; and to do it *εἰς τὸ παντελές, unceasingly, always*, so long as there are any who need pardon, and who can obtain it.

Πάντοτε ζῶν, ever living, i. e. always abiding or continuing a priest; comp. vs. 3, 8, 17, 21, 24. *Ζάω, to live, to endure, to be*

perennial; as frequently before. The mere *continual existence* of Christ is not at all the question here, but the perpetuity of his priesthood; so that ζῶν plainly refers to his ever living or continuing as a priest; in which capacity ἐντυγχάνει ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν, as follows.

Εἰς τὸ ἐντυγχάνειν ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν, to intercede for them, or rather *to interpose in their behalf*. The proper meaning of ἐντυγχάνω is, *to go to any one, to approach him, to meet him*, for the sake of accusing, defending, convicting, or delivering any person, or of transacting any business which has respect to him. Here, it is plainly in the sense of *aiding, defending* or *delivering;* as the preceding σώζειν clearly indicates. It means here, also, to do something, or to interpose, in such a way as is appropriate to the priest's office. But *to intercede*, in the sense of *making supplication*, is not appropriate to any part of the priests' office under the Levitical law; at least, not to any which the Scriptures have presented to our view. The reader will search in vain for any direction to the priests, under the Jewish economy, to perform such a duty as priests; and all the testimony we have to shew us that the priests did make intercession, is what Philo says of their duties, Legat. ad Caium. II. 77. p. 591. (edit. Mangey); see on v. 27. Even the passage in Luke 1: 9, 10, seems to indicate nothing that solves the question. We must therefore understand ἐντυγχάνει here, in a more *general* sense, and refer it to *any aid*, which Christ as high priest extends to those who approach God, confiding in him, 4: 16. He is able σώζειν αὐτούς, because he is a perpetual priest ἐντυγχάνειν ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν, i. e. *to interpose in their behalf, to procure for them such aid* as they may need. So the priests, under the Levitical dispensation, were the *internuntii* between God and the people, and procured blessings for them, not only by presenting the offerings which they brought, but by inquiring of the Lord for them, or consulting his holy oracle. I acquiesce, therefore, in the *general* idea of ἐντυγχάνειν here, viz. *interposing in our behalf, assisting;* and I believe, that all attempts to draw from the word any thing more than this, is substituting imagination for well grounded reasoning.

The writer, having now commented on the priesthood of Christ as compared with that of Melchisedek, and having also made some deductions from the nature of Christ's priestly office as thus exhibited, which are much to his purpose, resumes the subject which he had dropped at 5: 10, and which he had first proposed in 5: 2, 3. In 5: 7—9 he had shewn the similarity between Christ and the Jewish priests, in regard to the power of sympathising with the suffering, inasmuch as both he and they were sufferers themselves. But he did not intend that the ἀσθένεια of the Jewish priests should be predicated of Jesus, in *all* respects. To guard against this, our author again introduces the topic here, and shows how far superior the priest of the new covenant is, in a *moral* respect, to the priests of the old.

26. *Τοιοῦτος γὰρ ἡμῖν ἔπρεπεν ἀρχιερεύς, moreover, such a high priest was needful for us. Πρέπω* signifies, ordinarily, *that which is becoming, proper, fit.* But here *ἔπρεπε* seems plainly to be equivalent to *τὸ ἀναγκαῖον*; as in Matt. 3: 15. So Luther, sollten wir haben, *we must have.* So Ernesti, Calovius.

Ὅσιος, holy, not merely קָדוֹשׁ here, but צַדִּיק, חָסִיד, תָּמִים; for *moral*, internal holiness or purity of nature is intended. *Ἄκακος, harmless, qui malum non fecit*, whose external conduct towards others corresponds with internal *ὁσιότης*.

Ἀμίαντος, undefiled, has reference to the ceremonial purity which was peculiarly required of the Jewish high priests. *Ἀμίαντος* has here, however, a *moral* sense, and expresses, summarily and with intensity, the ideas conveyed by *ὅσιος* and *ἄκακος*. *Κεχωρισμένος ἀπὸ τῶν ἁμαρτωλῶν, separated from sinners*, i. e. removed from all that could contaminate or render impure; diverse from sinners; unlike to them. It is nearly synonymous in its meaning with *ἀμίαντος*, and is added, (as is usual in such cases with the sacred writers), for the sake of intensity.

Ὑψηλότερος τῶν οὐρανῶν γενόμενος, exalted above the heavens, i. e. seated at the right hand of the majesty on high, 1: 3. Comp. Phil. 2: 9. Colos. 1: 18. Heb. 2: 9. 8: 1. Rev. 5: 12. Matt. 25: 31.

By these assertions, the writer designs to shew his Hebrew readers, that Christ was, in all personal respects, exalted above the Jewish high priests. They were "compassed with infirmities," but he was spotless; if they were ceremonially undefiled, he was morally so; if they were placed in an exalted station, he was infinitely above them, being, like Melchisedek, king as well as priest, inasmuch as he was raised to the throne of God above the heavens, 1: 3. To finish the comparison, he goes on to say, that, in consequence of his perfect purity, he needed no expiatory offering for himself, as the Jewish high priest did.

27. *Ὃς οὐκ ἔχει λαοῦ, who has not, like the high priests, any daily necessity of offering sacrifices, first for his own sins, and then for those of the people.* Many doubts have been raised by critics, about the meaning of *καθ' ἡμέραν* here, because they have supposed that the high priest officiated in person, only on the great day of atonement. But that these doubts are without any good ground, may be seen by consulting Lev. 6: 19—22. Num. 28: 3, 4. Philo, who was cotemporary with the apostles, says, *ἀρχιερεὺς, κατὰ τοὺς νόμους, ἐυχὰς δὲ καὶ θυσίας τελῶν καθ' ἑκάστην ἡμέραν, the high priest, agreeably to the laws, makes daily supplications and sacrifices,* see on v. 25. It happens in this case, as in all others of a like nature which occur in our epistle, that the deep and accurate knowledge of the writer, in respect to every thing which concerned the Jewish dispensation, becomes apparent, just in proportion to our knowledge of the usages which really existed under that dispensation.

Τοῦτο γὰρ ἀνενέγκας, for this he did, once for all, when he offered up himself. Ἀναφέρω is like the Heb. הֶעֱלָה. *Προσφέρω* is also used in a similar sense.

Ἐφάπαξ, lit. *for once, einmal;* but according to usage, it denies a repetition of the act or thing to which it relates, and so means *once for all.*

28. *Ὁ νόμος γὰρ ἀσθένειαν, now the law constitutes men high priests, who have infirmity.* Γὰρ may here mean *truly, indeed;* but the connexion is better kept up by the version which I have given it.

Ἔχοντας ἀσθένειαν here means, those who have infirmity of a moral nature, i. e. who commit sin, who are sinners; so also in verse 2.

Ὁ λόγος δὲ ὁρκωμοσίας τετελειωμένον, but the word of the oath, which was subsequent to the law, [constitutes as high priest] *the Son, who is forever exalted to glory.* Ὁ λόγος τῆς ὁρκωμοσίας is the same as ὅρκος, or ὁρκωμοσία in verse 20. The writer refers to Ps. 110: 4. *The word of the oath,* i. q. the oath that was uttered.

Τὸν εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα τετελειωμένον. On τελειόω, see 2: 10, τελειῶσαι. I regard the expression as designed here to convey, for substance, the idea of a state of the highest perfection and exaltation, which forbids the supposition that he can have such *ἀσθένειαν* as the Jewish priests.

CHAP. VIII.

1. *Κεφάλαιον δὲ ἐπὶ τοῖς λεγομένοις, the most important thing, however, in regard to what we are now treating of, is.* That *κεφάλαιον* has such a meaning as is here assigned to it, is beyond any reasonable doubt. So Suidas, referring to this passage, says, *Κεφάλαιον, ἐκεῖ, τὸ μέγιστον.* So Theophylact, on this verse, *ἵνα εἴπω τὸ μέγιστον καὶ συνεκτικώτερον, that I may say the greatest thing and the most comprehensive.* So Theodoret understood *κεφάλαιον;* for he says, *τὴν μεγίστην τιμὴν τελευταίαν κατέλιπε, he reserved the greatest honour until the last.* So Philo, *τὸ κεφάλαιον τῶν ἀνδρῶν τῶν πολεμιστῶν, the head of the warriors.* So the classic authors also, as may be seen in Schneider, and in any good Greek Lexicon; to which may be added, many of the most distinguished among late critics on our epistle, such as Zachariae, Michaelis, Heinrichs, Storr, Dindorf, Schulz, Iaspis, and others. The context, also, renders it quite plain, that such must be the meaning, and that *κεφάλαιον* does not here mean, *sum*, or *summary*, in the sense of *recapitulation* or *contents;* for what follows is no *recapitulation* of what precedes, but a new topic, exhibiting a different attitude or view of Christ's priesthood. In the preceding chapter, the apostle has treated of the superiority of Christ's priesthood, in respect to duration and succession. He has shewn, also, that Christ was made priest by the solemnity of an oath, while the Levites were not introduced to their office by such a solemnity. The priesthood of the latter was liable to continual interruption and vicissitude, from the frail and dying state of those who were invested with the office of priest; while the perpetuity of Christ's priestly office, was never exposed to interruption from causes of this nature. Finally, the Jewish priests were themselves not only peccable but peccant men, and needed to offer sacrifices on their own account, as well as for the sake of others; while Christ was holy, and perfectly free from all sin, and exalted to a glorious state in which he was placed forever beyond the reach of it, so that his sacrifice would enure solely to the benefit of sinful men.

Thus much the writer has already said, respecting the nature of the office conferred on Christ, and his qualifications to discharge the

duties of it. He now comes, in chap. VIII—X., to the consideration of the duties themselves, viz. the nature of the sacrifice which Jesus offers; the place where it is offered; the efficacy which it has to atone for sin; and the difference, in regard to all these points, between the sacrifice offered by Christ, and that which was presented by the Jewish priests. This topic, then, differs from those which were discussed in chap. VII. Κεφάλαιον, therefore, does not mean *recapitulation* here, although there can be no doubt, that the word itself is capable of conveying such a sense, if the nature of the case demanded it.

Moreover, from the circumstances just presented it is evident, that what follows is the κεφάλαιον, *principal thing*, which belongs to the topic of the writer. The dignity of an office, and the particular qualifications of the person who is to be invested with it, are things which in their own nature are subordinate to the great end which is to be accomplished by the office itself. They are only subordinate *means* of bringing about the end of the office; while this end or design itself must, from its own nature, be regarded as the *principal thing*, κεφάλαιον.

Ἐπὶ τοῖς λεγομένοις, *in respect to* etc. That ἐπὶ often has this sense, may be seen in the lexicons. Λεγομένοις, pres. part. passive, means, *the subjects now spoken upon* or *discussed*. Τοιοῦτον ἀρχιερεά, *such a priest*, viz. as had been described in the preceding chapter; see 7: 26.

Ὃς ἐκάθισεν ἐν δεξιᾷ κ. τ. λ., see on 1: 3 ult. It is quite possible, that the writer, in using ἐκάθισε here, may intend tacitly to introduce a comparison between Christ as a priest, performing the duties of his office, *seated* on a throne of majesty, and the high priest of the Jews, who, in the discharge of all the duties of his function, *stood* before the Lord. But I do not think the point clear enough to be insisted on. Thus much is clear, viz. that the writer means to shew the very great difference between Christ and the Jewish high priest, by adverting to the fact, that the one is seated on the throne of God in the heavens, while the other only ministers on earth, in a temple reared by the hands of men. This last idea he proceeds more fully to develope, in verse

2. Τῶν ἁγίων λειτουργός, *a minister of the sanctuary*, i. e. of the adytum, sanctum sanctorum, הַקֹּדֶשׁ; in other words, the high priest of the temple above, having access to הַקֹּדֶשׁ, *the holy* or

most holy place. Ἁγίων may also mean, *of holy things*, i. e. ἁγίων ἀληθινῶν, of the truly sacred or holy things in heaven. But I prefer the former sense; as the comparison thus becomes more direct with the Jewish high priest. Λειτουργός means, *a public minister, qui publicis officiis praeest*, vel, *munera publica praestat.* Says Ulpian, the Scholiast upon Demosth. contra Septin., λεῖτον, ἐκάλουν οἱ παλαιοὶ τὸ δημόσιον, *what was public, the ancients called* λεῖτον. The ending -ουργός comes from the verb ἔργειν, *opero, officio fungor.*

Καὶ τῆς σκηνῆς τῆς ἀληθινῆς, *the true tabernacle*, means, that which is spiritual, immutable, and eternal in the heavens; and which therefore is called *true* or *real*, in distinction from the earthly tabernacle that was made by the hands of men, and was of materials earthly and perishable. The tabernacle in heaven is the *substance*; that on earth, the image or type. Hence the former is, by way of distinction, properly named ἀληθινῆς, i. e. *real*, or *that which truly and permanently exists.*

What is intimated by this appellation, is now more fully expressed. Ἣν ἔπηξεν ὁ κύριος, καὶ οὐκ ἄνθρωπος, *which the Lord constructed* or *reared, and not man*: i. e. the true or heavenly tabernacle, is not material, was not formed by human architects, but reared by the immediate power of God. Whether the writer means here to speak of an actual heavenly structure, having physical form and location, is a question which will be brought up by v. 5. below.

3. Πᾶς γὰρ ἀρχιερεὺς καθίσταται, *now every high priest is appointed to present oblations and sacrifices*; i. e. it enters into the very nature of such an office, that duties of this kind must be performed by him who sustains it; see the original proposition of this subject, in 5: 1. Δῶρα, *oblations* or *gifts* that were without blood; such as the first fruits of grain, vegetables, etc. Θυσίας, *animals slain for sacrifice.* Both were presented to God by the priest, who acted as the *internuntius* between Jehovah and the offerer.

Ὅθεν ἀναγκαῖον προσενέγκῃ, *whence, it is necessary that this* [high priest] *also have some offering to present*; i. e. if Christ be high priest, and if such an office is necessarily connected with the duty of presenting some offering; then Christ, of course, must present one. What the oblation made by Christ is, he tells us more fully, in chap. 9: 11—14, 25, 26.

4. The apostle proceeds to shew the reason, why Christ is a priest in the tabernacle above, and not in that on the earth. *Εἰ μὲν γὰρ ἦν δῶρα, but if he were on earth, then he could not be a priest, because there are priests appointed by law who present oblations according to the law.* The argument is thus; 'The Scripture calls Christ, *ἱερεὺς εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα;* but this he could not be on earth, inasmuch as there are already *ἱερεῖς* there, by divine appointment; consequently, he is *ἱερεύς* in the temple above, and must present his offering there. *Δῶρα* means here *oblations of every kind*, comprehending the same things as *δῶρά τε καὶ θυσίας* in v. 3.

5. *Οἵτινες ὑποδείγματι ἐπουρανίων, the same who perform service in* [that tabernacle which is] *a mere copy of the heavenly* [sanctuary]. Comp. v. 2 and 9: 24. *Ὑπόδειγμα* means, *image, effigy, copy, resemblance, imitation;* all designating the idea, that the earthly temple stands related to the heavenly one, only as a painting or picture of any thing, does to the object itself. The heavenly *σκηνή* is *ἀληθινός;* the earthly one *σκιαρά.*

Σκιά, shadow, slight and imperfect image, sketch; distinct from *εἰκών, a picture completed, an accurate resemblance.* It is also the correlate antithesis of *σῶμα, body;* see Col. 2: 17. *Σκιά* I have construed as qualifying *ὑποδείγματι*, and rendered both words, *mere copy*, i. e. I have construed them as a Hendiadys. The meaning is, that it is *only a resemblance;* i. e. the earthly tabernacle is but a *shadow*, a *mere imperfect effigy*, of the heavenly one. Consequently, the office of priest in the latter, is far more elevated than the like office in the former.

Τῶν ἐπουρανίων, i. e. *ἁγίων, sanctuary.* So in v. 2, *ἁγίων λειτουργός*, i. e. *ἁγίων* [*τόπων*] *λειτουργός, a minister of the holy of holies*, or, *of the most holy place.*

Καθὼς κεχρημάτισται ὅρει, for Moses, when about to build the tabernacle, was divinely admonished; "See now," said he, "that thou make all things according to the pattern shewed thee, in the mount."

Χρηματίζω means, *to give oracular responses*, or, *to make communications to men in any supernatural way.* It is spoken, *actively*, of God and not of men. So Phavorinus, *χρηματίζειν, λέγεται ἐπὶ θεῶν· τὸ δὲ διαλέγεσθαι, ἐπὶ ἀνθρώπων.* In the passive voice

(as here), it means, *to receive divine responses* or *communications*, of any kind.

Ἐπιτελεῖν, *to complete, finish, perform, do, make.* Θησι, viz. God saith, in Ex. 25: 40. comp. Ex. 25: 9. 26: 30. 27: 8. Num. 8: 4. 1 Chron. 28: 11, 19. Acts 7: 44. The Hebrew word, to which τύπον here corresponds, is תַּבְנִית, *model, sketch, delineation, form.* Τύπος means, *model* or *form* here; as it often does. Ὄρει refers to mount Sinai; for it was during the theophany there, that communications were made to Moses on the subject of building the tabernacle; see Ex. 24: 18, comp. 25: 9, 40. 31: 18. 32: 1. See Excursus XV.

6 *Νυνὶ δὲ διαφορωτέρας τέτευχε λειτουργίας, but now has he obtained a service of a more excellent nature;* i. e. since he is not a priest in the earthly temple, but in the heavenly one, he has an office [πόσῳ] διαφορωτέρα, [so much] *more exalted*, viz. than that of the Levitical priests.

Ὅσῳ καὶ μεσίτης, *as much more, as the covenant, of which he is the mediator, is superior* [to the ancient one], *being sanctioned with better promises.* Πόσῳ must be understood in the clause preceding this, viz. πόσῳ διαφορωτέρας, in order to make out the comparison which its correlate ὅσῳ implies, in the latter. Νενομοθέτηται, *is sanctioned*, i. e. is promulgated and established with all the solemnity and stability of a law. The *better promises* follow, viz. in vs. 8—13. The imperfection of the first covenant, and the perfection of the second, is disclosed further, in 9: 9—14. 10: 1—22. 13: 9—14. From these passages it appears, that the first covenant promised only external purification, and the civil or ecclesiastical pardon of an offender who complied with the rites which it enjoined; but under the new covenant, real pardon of sin by God is to be obtained, with purification and peace of conscience, the hope of eternal life, and union at last with the assembly of the redeemed in a better world.

The sentiment of the apostle, then, in our verse, stands thus; 'The office with which Christ is invested as a priest, or his priestly function, is as much superior to that of the Levitical priests, as the covenant under which he holds his office, excels, in the blessings which it promises, the covenant introduced by Moses.'

7. *Εἰ γὰρ ἡ πρώτη τόπος, moreover, if that first* [covenant] *had been faultless, then no place for the second would have been*

sought. Ἡ πρώτη, sc. διαθήκη, means here, the Jewish dispensation or economy. Ἄμεμπτος, *without fault, free from defect.* The meaning is not that the Mosaic economy had *positive* faults, viz. such things as were palpably wrong or erroneous; but that it did not contain in itself all the provision necessary for pardon of sin, and the rendering of the conscience peaceful and pure; which the gospel does effect. See on 7: 19 and comp. 9: 9—14, 23, 24. 10: 1—3, 10—14. The law, then, was not τέλειος, i. e. ἄμεμπτος; nor was it designed to be any thing more, than a dispensation *preparatory* to the gospel.

Ἐζητεῖτο τόπος, *no room had been sought*, or, *no provision had been made, for a second*, i. e. for a new covenant, or, the gospel dispensation.

8. Μεμφόμενος γὰρ αὐτοῖς λέγει, *but, finding fault* [with the first covenant], *he says to them*, i. e. the Jews. The passage is capable of another construction, viz, *finding fault with them*, i. e. the Jews; in which way a majority of the commentators, with Chrysostom, have understood it. Μέμφομαι can undoubtedly govern αὐτοῖς in the dative; but still, I prefer the other construction. The apostle says, "The former covenant was not ἄμεμπτος." He goes on to prove this; but how? By quoting a passage from Jer. 31: 31—34. But what does this passage contain? Μέμφεται, says the apostle, i. q. μεμφόμενος ἐστι, i. e. it affirms that the law *is* not ἄμεμπτος; for these two words are plainly connected as *antitheses*, by the writer. If so, then μεμφόμενος applies to διαθήκη and not to αὐτοῖς; and so I understand it. If the ellipsis be supplied it will read, μεμφόμενος αὐτῇ, sc. διαθήκῃ. In such a case, αὐτοῖς is governed by λέγει.

In addition to the argument thus drawn from the writer's purpose, I would also suggest, that the whole of Jer. xxxi. which precedes the passage quoted, is made up of consolation and promise, instead of reproof or finding fault. The *imputation of defect*, then, must be such an imputation, in this case, as is implied in the passage quoted. But in this, the declaration that a new covenant should supersede the old one, implies, of course, that the old one had failed to accomplish all the objects to be desired, i. e. it was defective.

The apostle evidently understands the passage quoted, as originally having respect to the gospel dispensation; nor can I per-

ceive any good reason why it should not be so understood. There is the same objection, that any prophecy whatever should be understood as having regard to this dispensation, as there would be to this being so understood; consequently, there is sufficient reason why this should be understood as the apostle has explained it, unless we reject altogether the idea, that any truly prophetic declarations of such a nature can and do exist.

Ἰδοὺ ἡμέραι καινήν, behold the days are coming, saith the Lord, when I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel and with the house of Judah. *Ἰδού* corresponds to the Hebrew הִנֵּה, and is used to excite the particular attention of persons, who are addressed, to any thing or subject. It is Hebraism, and not of classic usage; at least not in any measure so frequently employed in the classics, as by the writers of the New Testament. *Ἰδού* is accented on the ultimate, to mark it as an *adverb*, and to distinguish it from *ἴδου* 2. aor. imp. of the verb *εἶδω*.

Ἡμέραι ἔρχονται is equivalent to the Hebrew יָמִים בָּאִים, which is used indefinitely for any future period, whether near or remote. The simple meaning of the expression is, 'At some future period, I will make, etc.'

Ἐπὶ τὸν οἶκον Ἰσραὴλ καὶ ἐπὶ τὸν οἶκον Ἰούδα, i. q. Hebrew בֵּית יְהוּדָה וְיִשְׂרָאֵל, i. e. *house, family, tribe,* or *nation of Judah and Israel.* The meaning is, with all the twelve tribes, i. e. the whole of the Hebrew nation. *Ἐπὶ τὸν οἶκον,* i. q. *ἐπὶ τῷ οἴκῳ,* see Wahl's Lexicon on *ἐπί*, no. 8. a. In the Septuagint, the passage reads, *καὶ διαθήσομαι τῷ οἴκῳ Ἰσραὴλ καὶ τῷ οἴκῳ Ἰούδα διαθήκην καινήν.*

Διαθήκην is commonly employed by the Seventy, in order to translate בְּרִית. The general idea of *διαθήκη* is, *disposition* or *arrangement* of any kind, or in regard to any matter; from the verb *διατίθημι, to dispose of, to arrange.* Hence, it is sometimes employed by classic writers, in the sense of *foedus, compact* or *covenant* between two parties; but not so in the New Testament. Like the Hebrew בְּרִית, (to which, according to the usus loquendi of the New Testament, it generally corresponds), it often means *law, precept:* even particular precept, as in Acts 7: 8, the precept of circumcision; in Rom. 9: 4, *αἱ διαθῆκαι, the tables of the law,* i. e. the ten commandments, comp. Deut. 4: 13, where בְּרִית is explained by עֲשֶׂרֶת הַדְּבָרִים, *the ten commandments;* comp. also

Deut. 9: 9, 11. So Heb. 9: 4, *κιβωτὸν τῆς διαθήκης, the ark* which contained the *διαθήκην*, i. e. the two tables of the ten commandments, (i. q. אֲרוֹן בְּרִית־יְהוָה, Num. 10: 33); and afterward, in the same verse, *αἱ πλάκες τῆς διαθήκης, the* [stone] *tablets containing the ten commandments.* The general idea of *law, precept, statute,* is very commonly annexed to בְּרִית in Hebrew, where the Septuagint render it by *διαθήκη*; e. g. Ex. 19: 5, et al. saepe. Both in classic authors, and in the New Testament, it has also the meaning of *last will, testament;* e. g. Gal. 3: 15. Heb. 9: 16, 17.

Most frequently of all, is בְּרִית in the Old Testament, and *διαθήκη* in the New, employed to designate a *promise, compact,* or *agreement* on the part of God with his people, that on condition of doing thus and so, blessings of such and such a nature shall be bestowed upon them. It comes, in this way, very commonly to designate *the whole Jewish economy,* (as we call it), with its conditions and promises; and by the writers of the New Testament it is employed, in a similar way, to designate *the new economy* or dispensation of Christ, with all its conditions and promised blessings. Thus, *ἡ παλαιὰ* or *πρώτη διαθήκη* means, *the Jewish dispensation;* and *ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη* means, *the Christian dispensation.* The idea often annexed by readers to the word *covenant,* viz. *mutual compact,* and a *quid pro quo* in respect to each of the parties, is not the Scriptural one. The meaning altogether predominant is, *an arrangement* on the part of God in respect to men, in consequence of which certain blessings are secured to them by his promise, on condition that they comply with the demands which he makes, i. e. obey his precepts. *Διαθήκη,* then, embraces both *precept* and *promise;* and may be used for either, or for both at the same time, *pro re natâ;* and it often is so used, in the Old Testament and also in the New.

In our text, *διαθήκην καινήν* means, *a new arrangement* or *disposition* made by Christ, i. e. one which has, in some respects, new conditions and new promises.

9. *Οὐ κατὰ τὴν διαθήκην κ. τ. λ.* This clause is explanatory of the word *καινήν* in the preceding verse. The meaning is, 'The covenant which I will make, at a future period, with the Jewish nation, (i. e. the dispensation under which I will place them), shall be different from that which I made, when I brought them out of Egypt.'

Ἐν ἡμέρᾳ ἐπιλαβομένου μου τῆς χειρὸς αὐτῶν, Hebrew בְּיוֹם הֶחֱזִיקִי בְיָדָם. *Χειρὸς*, in the genitive, is governed by the force of *ἐπί* in composition with *λαβομένου*; so *ἐπιλαμβάνειν τῆς χειρός, to take by the hand, to lead*, etc. *Ἐξαγαγεῖν, to bring or lead out, εἰς τό* being understood before the infinitive here. Both words together mean, *assisted* or *helped to come out*. This clause is added by the writer, in order to shew plainly, that he means the *διαθήκην*, which was made when Moses led the Israelites out of Egypt, through the wilderness, toward Canaan.

Ὅτι αὐτοὶ οὐκ ἔμειναν ἐν τῇ διαθήκῃ μου, because they did not keep my covenant. The Hebrew is, אֲשֶׁר הֵמָּה הֵפֵרוּ אֶת־בְּרִיתִי, *because they violated my covenant*, i. e. failed to perform the conditions on which I promised to bestow blessings upon them. The Greek *οὐκ ἔνεμειναν*, is a version *ad sensum*, but not *ad literam*. *Μένω* or *ἐμμένω* means, among other things, *to persevere, to be constant, to continue firm* or *steadfast* in any thing. The Greek expression, *οὐκ ἐνέμειναν* is softer than הֵפֵרוּ; and as *οὐκ ἔμειναν* conveys, for *substance*, the same idea as הֵפֵרוּ, we may well suppose it was preferred to a stronger expression by the writer of our epistle, while he was addressing himself to his Jewish brethren. *Ὅτι οὐκ ἐνέμειναν* assigns a reason why a new covenant was to be made, viz. because the old one is broken, and because it has not been kept on the part of the Jews, and will not be kept, therefore a new one, on different conditions and with better promises, shall be made.

Κἀγὼ ἠμέλησα αὐτῶν, Hebrew וְאָנֹכִי בָּעַלְתִּי בָם, (Eng. version) *although I was an husband to them*; Gesenius, *although I was their Lord*; both according to a sense of בָּעַל, which is a usual one. But that the Septuagint have given a correct version here, and the apostle properly adopted it in our text, is very probable. The Arabic بَعَلَ (بَعِلَ) means *to loath, to reject with loathing*; see Castell Lex. on بَعَلَ. In this sense, it is probable, בָּעַל is used, in Jer. 31: 32, and, as some think, in Jer. 3: 14. So Abul Walid, Joseph Kimchi, and Rabbi Tanchum understood the word in 31: 32; and in like manner many modern critics. The Greek *ἠμέλησα* means, *to neglect, to disregard, to treat with neglect*, and is (like *οὐκ ἐνέμειναν*) a softer expression than the corresponding Hebrew one, while it conveys for substance the same idea. The Septua-

gint, in their rendering of בְּעֻלָתִי בָּ, appear to have preserved an ancient meaning of the word בָּעַל, the correctness of which the Arabic is a pledge for, at the present time.

The *disregarding*, or *treating with neglect* (*ἠμέλεσα*), here spoken of, has reference to the various punishments inflicted upon Israel for their wickedness, instead of the blessings which they would have received, had they been obedient.

10. *Ὅτι αὕτη ἡ διαθήκη κύριος, but this is the covenant which I will make with the house of Israel, after those days, saith the Lord.* *Ὅτι, but*, so the Hebrew כִּי, Ps. 44: 23. 130: 4. Job. 14: 16, al. The Lexicons are imperfect in regard to this word. *Οἴκῳ Ἰσραήλ, house of Israel* in this verse means, the Jews in general, the Israelitish nation; for so the whole nation is often named, in the Old Testament and in the New.

Διδοὺς νόμους μου εἰς τὴν διάνοιαν αὐτῶν, I will put my laws upon their mind, Hebrew בְּקִרְבָּם. For *διδούς*, the Septuagint has *διδοὺς δώσω*, meaning, I suppose, *deeply infix*. This sense of *δίδωμι* comes from the Hebrew נָתַן; see Wahl on *δίδωμι*, no. 8. *Διδούς*, like the present participle in Hebrew, is used for the future *δώσω*. To *place* or *put laws upon their minds*, of course means to inscribe or engrave them, as it were, i. e. deeply to infix them. *Καὶ ἐπὶ καρδίας αὐτῶν ἐπιγράψω αὐτούς, and I will engrave them upon their hearts*, or, *inscribe them upon their hearts*; an expression parallel to the preceding, and of the same import. The meaning of both is, I will give them a lasting spirit of obedience to my laws, so that they will no more violate them as they have done; i. e. the new covenant shall be distinguished from the old, by a higher and more permanent spirit of obedience in those who live under it.

Καὶ ἔσομαι αὐτοῖς λαόν, and I will be their God, and *they shall be my people*; i. e. I will grant them peculiar protection and blessings, and they shall be peculiarly obedient and devoted to me. Comp. Rev. 21: 3, 4, 7. Zech. 8: 8. For the meaning of the Hebrew idiom, *εἰς θεόν* and *εἰς λαόν*, see on Heb. 1: 5.

11. *Καὶ οὐ μὴ διδάξουσιν κύριον, no one shall teach his own fellow-citizen, nor any one his brother, saying, Know the Lord.* For *τὸν πολίτην*, various manuscripts and editions have *τὸν πλησίον*. The original Hebrew is, וְלֹא יְלַמְּדוּ עוֹד אִישׁ אֶת־רֵעֵהוּ וְאִישׁ אֶת־אָחִיו, which, interpreted agreeably to a well known Hebrew idiom,

means simply, *one shall not teach another*; for אִישׁ and רֵעַ, as well as אִישׁ and אָחִיו simply denote, *each other*, or *one another*, when thus coupled together. *Τὸν πολίτην*, in our text, corresponds to the Hebrew רֵעֵהוּ; and this word the Septuagint almost always render by *πλησίον*. This is the ground, probably, why the reading *πλησίον* has been preferred by Bengel, Carpzoff, and some other critics. But *πολίτην* is in the best manuscripts; and Wetstein, Griesbach, Matthiae, Rosenmueller, Knapp, Heinrichs, Tittmann, and others, prefer it. The Septuagint, moreover, render רֵעַ by *πολίτης*, in Prov. 11: 9. 24: 28. Whether, however, *πλησίον* or *πολίτην* be adopted, the sense is not changed. The meaning of the whole phrase, is simply what the Hebrew idiom allows it to signify, viz, 'One shall have no need to teach another.' The repetition of the sentiment, by *τὸν πολίτην αὐτοῦ* and *τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ*, belongs merely to the poetic parallelism of the original Hebrew, which expresses the same thought in two different ways; as is constantly done by the synonymous parallelisms of the Old Testament.

"Οτι πάντες μεγάλου αὐτῶν, for all shall know me, from the least to the greatest, i. e. all of whatever rank or condition, high or low, rich or poor—all classes of people, shall have a knowledge of God. *Μικροῦ* and *μεγάλου* here refer to *condition*, rather than *age*.

The writer does not mean that religious instruction will be altogether *superseded*, when the happy period arrives of which he speaks; but that, inasmuch as the laws of God will be *infixed upon* the hearts of his people, and engraven upon their minds, none will be ignorant, as in former times, of his true character and the requirements of his law. The words are not to be urged to a literal explanation. The meaning of the whole plainly is, that the knowledge of true religion, or of God, should become universal, under the *new covenant*, so that no one might be found, who could properly be addressed as knowing nothing of the true God. The implication, moreover, contained in this, is, that under the *old covenant* many had been thus ignorant; a fact highly credible, considering the frequent lapses of the Jews into a state of idolatry.

12. *"Οτι ἵλεως ἔσομαι . . . ἔτι, for I will be merciful in respect to their iniquities, and their sins and their transgressions will I remember no more. "Ιλεως, propitious, mild, clement*, governs the dative

ταῖς ἀδικίαις, and (like סְלִיחָה to which it corresponds) designates the idea of *readiness to pardon*, or, *to deal mildly* with offenders.

Τῶν ἀνομιῶν αὐτῶν is not in the Hebrew, nor in the common Septuagint, nor Vulgate, Syr. Copt. Ethiop. The Hebrew has only לַחַטֹּאתָם, to which *τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν αὐτῶν* answers, in our text. It is difficult, or rather impossible, now to determine whether *τῶν ἀνομιῶν αὐτῶν* was originally inserted by the writer of our epistle, or crept in afterwards from some edition of the Septuagint which contained it. But whether it be admitted or excluded, it makes no difference in the *sentiment* of the passage; the first clause of which is the first member of a poetic parallelism, to which the second clause corresponds, echoing the same sentiment. *Ἵλεως εἶναι ταῖς ἀδικίαις* means, *to be forgiving, ready to pardon;* and *οὐ μνησθῆναι τῶν ἀνομιῶν* means, *to pass sins by unpunished, to treat offenders as though their sins were forgotten.* The expression, applied to God, is altogether *anthropopathic;* but so are most other expressions, which speak of him as acting in relation to such subjects.

Thus far the quotation from Jeremiah, in order to prove that a *new covenant*, better than the Mosaic one, was to be made with the people of God. The writer now adds, as a comment on what he had quoted,

13. *Ἐν τῷ λέγειν πρώτην, in saying a new* [covenant], *he represents the first* [covenant] *as old.* Of course, if a new one is to take the place of the former one, the former is considered as obsolete. *Πεπαλαίωκε*, like the Hebrew Piel and Hiphil, means *to represent a thing as old*, or, as *superannuated;* for in no other sense, did the words just quoted make the former covenant old.

Now follows the deduction of the apostle from this. *Τὸ δὲ παλαιούμενον ἀφανισμοῦ, now that which has become old, and is advancing in age, is near to dissolution. Παλαιόω* is more usually applied to *things*, and *γηράσκω* to *persons.* The use of two synonymous words here, serves merely to strengthen the representation, and is equivalent to saying, 'That which is very old.'

Ἀφανισμοῦ, lit. *disappearing, vanishing.* Applied to a law or dispensation, it means *abolition* or *abrogation.* The argument of the writer is thus; 'What is very old, is near dissolution; but the prophet Jeremiah has represented the former covenant as *πεπαλαι-*

ουμένην; therefore it is near dissolution, or, it is about to be dissolved or abrogated.

CHAP. IX.

For an illustration of the course of thought and reasoning in this chapter, see above, p. 121 seq.

1. *Εἶχε μὲν οὖν καὶ ἡ πρώτη κοσμικόν, moreover the first* [covenant] *also had ordinances of service, and a sanctuary of a worldly nature.* *Οὖν*, a sign of *transition* here, for a new subject is introduced. The force of *καί* here, is not easily described. I join it with *εἶχε* thus, 'Besides what I have said about the first covenant, let me add, that *εἶχε καί, it also had* ordinances, etc. All three particles, *μὲν οὖν καί*, might be rendered, *and besides, and further, and I may add*, etc.; but I prefer the manner in which I have rendered them. As to *μέν*, it is the mere sign of *protasis*; see below, on v. 11.

Ἡ πρώτη, i. e. *διαθήκη*, comp. 8: 6, 7, 13; not *ἡ πρώτη σκηνή*, as some critics have supposed.

Δικαιώματα λατρείας means, *a service arranged, conducted, by rules* or *ordinances*. *Λατρεία* designates the public service of the temple or tabernacle; and *δικαιώματα*, the *rules* or *precepts* which regulated it. *Ἅγιον* usually means, *sanctuary* or *holy place*, in a *general* sense, and so it may be taken here, viz. for the whole temple. But it may also be understood, as referring to that spacious apartment of the temple, in which the various articles of sacred furniture were placed that are immediately mentioned, which, however, is called by the writer, *ἅγια*, in v. 2. If it be the same as *ἅγια*, it is distinguished from *ἅγια ἁγίων*, in the third verse; which means the apartment behind the veil, where the ark, etc. were deposited. *Κοσμικόν* (from *κόσμος*) means, *pertaining to this world, of a terrestrial nature*, i. e. material, the opposite of *οὐ χειροποίητον* in 9: 11, 24, and i. q. *χειροποίητον*; the opposite also, of *Ἱερουσαλὴμ ἐπουράνιος*, 12: 22, comp. Rev. 21: 2. Some critics have explained *κοσμικόν* by *formosum, illustre*, because *κόσμος* sometimes signifies, *ornatus, elegantia*. But the adjective which designates the meaning correspondent with these significations, is *κόσμιος*, and not *κοσμικός*.

2. *Σκηνὴ γὰρ πρώτη, for an outer tabernacle was constructed.* *Σκηνή* evidently means here, only one apartment of the *ἱερον* or sacred building; comp. v. 3, where another *σκηνή* is described. *Ἡ πρώτη* means, *that which first presents itself*, viz. to the worshipper as he enters the outer court of the building; therefore *outer σκηνή* or apartment, the most holy place being the *inner* one. We might expect, according to the rules laid down by grammarians concerning the Greek article, that either *σκηνή* would have the article, or *πρώτη* would omit it. Constructions, however, of the same kind as *σκηνὴ ἡ πρώτη*, are frequent in the New Testament; e. g. Rom. 2: 9 *ἀνθρώπου τ ο ῦ κ α τ ε ρ γ α ζ ο μ έ ν ο υ*; 2: 14, *ἔθνη τ ὰ μὴ ἔχοντα*; 5: 5, *πνεύματος ἁγίου τ ο ῦ δ ο θ έ ν τ ο ς*. See Rom. 8: 33, 34. 1 Cor. 2: 7. Gal. 3: 21. 1 Thess. 1: 10. 1 Tim. 6: 13. 2 Tim. 1: 8, 9, 14. Heb. 6: 7, etc. See Gersdorf's Beiträge p. 355 seq. It happens in this case, (as in regard to most of the *definite* rules laid down about the use of the Greek article), that investigation shews the principle assumed to be by no means uniform, and that the Greek writers were less regular in regard to this matter, than the grammarians would fain have us believe. For the dimensions, etc. of the various *σκηναί*, or apartments of the temple, see 1 K. vi.

Ἐν ᾗ, ἥ τε λυχνία ἄρτων, in which [apartment] *was the candlestick, and the table, and the shew-bread.* For a description of the candlestick, see Ex. 25: 31—39. 37: 17—24. The Hebrew word answering to *λυχνία*, is מְנוֹרָה. The *τράπεζα* is described in Ex. 25: 23—29. The design of the table was, that the bread which was consecrated to the Lord might be placed upon it. *Πρόθησις τῶν ἄρτων, the exhibition of the bread*, viz. before Jehovah, is described in Ex. 25: 30 and Lev. 24: 5—9. The earlier Hebrew name was לֶחֶם הַפָּנִים, *presence-bread.* It is also called לֶחֶם עֶרֶךְ, and לֶחֶם הַמַּעֲרֶכֶת, *the arrangement of bread*, or, *the bread arranged*, in reference to the manner in which it was exhibited upon the table; see Lev. 24: 5, 6.

The altar of incense is omitted in this catalogue of sacred utensils; as it is omitted in the draft for building the tabernacle by Moses, in Ex. xxv. But it is mentioned in Ex. 30: 1, and 37: 25—28. 35: 15. So also the altar of burnt offering is omitted, in Ex. xxv., although it is mentioned in Ex. 35: 16. 38: 1; and many other utensils of the tabernacle also are omitted in Ex. xxv., which

are mentioned in Ex. xxxv. Our author expressly says (9: 5), that he shall not attempt to mention all the particulars of sacred apparatus for the temple service.

Ἥτις λέγεται ἅγια, which is called ἁ γ ι α, i. e. קֹדֶשׁ, מִקְדָּשׁ, *the holy place, the sanctuary;* a different apartment in the *ἱερον* or sacred enclosure, from the *ἅγια ἁγίων* mentioned in v. 3. *Ἅγια* in our text, is plural; for the singular fem. is written *ἁγία*, (with the accent on the penult), not *ἅγια*. The writer means to say that *ἡ σκηνὴ πρώτη; the outer apartment*, of the temple, was called *ἅγια*. The plural is used here in order to designate one apartment in the temple, just as it is in *ἅγια ἁγίων* (not *ἁγία ἁγίων*), v. 3; and both are conformed to a usage that is common in Hebrew, which not unfrequently employs the plural to designate, the *sanctuary*. E. g. Ps. 73: 17, מִקְדְּשֵׁי־אֵל, i. e. *ἅγια θεοῦ*. Ps. 68: 36, מִקְדָּשֶׁיךָ, *ἁγιά σου*. Lev. 21: 23, מִקְדָּשַׁי, *ἁγιά μου*, etc.

3. *Μετὰ δὲ τὸ δεύτερον καταπέτασμα, and behind the second vail.* A description of this vail is given, in Ex. 26: 31—33. 36: 35, 36. As the inner vail is here called *δεύτερον*, the necessary implication is, that there was a *πρῶτον* also; and accordingly we find it described in Ex. 26: 36, 37, and Ex. 36: 37, 38. The Hebrew name of the *inner* vail, (which separated the most holy place from the *ἅγια* or common sanctuary), is פָּרֹכֶת, as given in Ex. 26: 31—33, and in the corresponding Ex. 36: 35, 36, also Lev. 16: 2. The Hebrew name of the *outer* vail, which served as a *door* for the tabernacle, i. e. which covered the entrance passage to the first *ἅγιον*, is מָסָךְ. The former is called *καταπέτασμα* by the Septuagint, (as the apostle calls it in our text), in Ex. 26: 31, 33. Lev. 16: 2. Ex. 36: 35, and also by the Evangelists, Matt. 27: 58. Mark 15: 38; The latter, both *καταπέτασμα* and *ἐπίσπαστρον*, in the passages connected with those just cited. There was a third *external* covering or curtain for the tabernacle, (called יְרִיעָה, יְרִיעוֹת, in Ex. 26: 1, 2 seq.), which Dindorf says was a *third vail;* but which, manifestly, Paul does not reckon to be such; nor Moses, in the passages above cited.

Σκηνὴ ἡ λεγομένη ἅγια ἁγίων, the apartment which is called the holy of holies, i. e. the most holy place, i. q. קֹדֶשׁ הַקָּדָשִׁים, a common form of expression in Hebrew, in order to denote *intensity*. In regard to *ἡ λεγομένη*, after *σκηνή* without the article, see on *ἡ πρώτη* obove. *Κατεσκευάσθη* is understood after *σκηνν*; see, in

v. 2, where it is expressed. The inner sanctuary was called *most holy*, because there was the ark of the covenant, the mercy seat, etc.; and there the presence of Jehovah, (which the Jews in later times called שְׁכִינָה), was peculiarly manifested, so that this was regarded as his particular dwelling place, מְעוֹנָה.

4. *Χρυσοῦν ἔχουσα θυμιατήριον, containing the golden censer.* See Excursus XVI.

Καὶ τὴν κιβωτὸν χρυσίῳ, and the ark of the covenant, covered on every part with gold. *Κιβωτός* was a *coffer* or *chest*, made of wood, and covered with laminae of gold; a description of which is given in Ex. 25: 10—16. 37: 1—5. It is called *the ark of the covenant*, because in it were deposited the two *tables of the covenant*, (בְּרִית, see on *διαθήκην* in 8: 8, and comp. Deut. 4: 13. 9: 9, 11); which tables are also called *the two tables of testimony*, i. e. of statutes, שְׁנֵי לֻחוֹת הָעֵדוּת, Ex. 31: 18. Both the terms בְּרִית and עֵדוּת plainly mean, *laws*, *statutes*, or *precepts*, in this case, and both refer principally to the ten commandments; see 1 K. 8: 9, and Deut. 10: 1—5. 2 Chron. 5: 10. 6: 11.

Ἐν ᾗ στάμνος χρυσῆ ἔχουσα τὸ μάννα, in which [ark] *was a golden pot containing the manna.* The fact to which this alludes, is described in Ex. 16: 32—34; where the *στάμνος* is called simply צִנְצֶנֶת, i. e. *pot*, *urn*, *vessel for safe keeping*. Nothing is said, indeed, of its being *golden* in the Hebrew; but the Septuagint render צִנְצֶנֶת by *στάμνον χρυσοῦν*. Of the fact that it was so, no one will be disposed to doubt, who reads a description of the furniture of the most holy place, and finds that almost every thing within it was either pure gold, or was overlaid with gold; e. g. the ark, Ex. 25: 11; the mercy seat, 25: 17; the cherubim 25: 18; the pillars and hooks for the vail that separated the inner sanctuary from the other, 26: 31, 32. Who now can rationally suppose, that the urn containing manna, and the censer used on the great day of atonement, were not also *golden*? See Excursus XVII.

Μάννα; see on this word, Rosenm. on Ex. 16: 15; where the various derivations of the word are considered; the various species of manna described; and the fact shewn, that the supply of this food for the Israelites in the wilderness, was understood, by the writer of the narration in Exodus, to be miraculous.

Καὶ ἡ ῥάβδος Ἀαρὼν ἡ βλαστήσασα, and the rod of Aaron

which budded. See Num. 17: 1—10, and what is said respecting this rod and the pot of manna, in Exc. XVII.

Καὶ αἱ πλάκες τῆς διαθήκης, the tables of the covenant, means the stone tablets on which the ten commandments were inscribed, and which were deposited in the ark, Ex. 31: 18. 32: 16. 34: 28, where *the words of the covenant* are expressly said to be *the ten commandments;* Deut. 10: 1, 2. 1 K. 8: 9. 2 Chron. 5: 10. The writer asserts, therefore, that the pot of manna, the rod of Aaron, and the two stone tablets on which the ten commandments were inscribed, were all laid up originally in the *κιβωτός.*

5. *Ὑπεράνω δὲ αὐτῆς χερουβὶμ τὸ ἱλαστήριον, and over it* [the ark] *were splendid Cherubim, which overshadowed the covering of the ark.* See the description of the Cherubim in Ex. 25: 18—20. 1 K. 8: 6, 7. 1 Chron. 28: 18. That Cherubim were *symbolical* images or representations, is quite plain from comparing the various descriptions given of them in different passages of Scripture; e. g. Ex. 25: 18—20. 26: 31. 1 K. 6: 23—29, 32, and Ezek. i. and x., particularly 10: 20—22. I understand the word *δόξης* as referring to *the splendor* of these symbolical figures, which were covered with gold throughout, Ex. 25: 18—20. 1 K. 6: 28. Some understand *δόξης* of the glory which was displayed under and around them; to which they suppose a reference to be made in Ps. 80: 1 [2].

Κατασκιάζοντα refers to the outstretched wings of the Cherubim over the *ἱλαστήριον,* as described in the passages above quoted. *Ἱλαστήριον* here means, the *lid* or *covering* of the *κιβωτός,* which was pure gold, Ex. 25: 17, 21. In Hebrew it is called כַּפֹּרֶת, which the Seventy have rendered *ἱλαστήριον,* in Ex. 25: 17, 21. As כָּפַר means *to cover* sin, i. e. *to make atonement* for it, so כַּפֹּרֶת may very naturally be rendered, *ἱλαστήριον,* since it was by sprinkling blood upon this *ἱλαστήριον,* by the high priest, that atonement was made, Lev. 16: 14. *Ἱλαστήριον,* understood in reference to this, might be translated, *the place* or *instrument of propitiation,* or (with our English translators) *mercy-seat.* It was over this, that the divine glory was seen, i. e. a supernatural, excessive brightness; and hence God was supposed to be seated on it, as his throne, and from it to dispense his mercy, when atonement was made for the sins of the people, by sprinkling it with blood. Hence our appellation, *mercy seat.*

Περὶ ὧν μέρος, respecting which things, it is not my present design to speak with particularity. *Ὧν* here refers to the various articles of sacred furniture, which he had just been mentioning. He means to say, that a particular description of these, and of all the various utensils of the sanctuary, is not what he intends to give; i. e. he shall content himself with merely having suggested those which were already named.

6. *Τούτων δὲ οὕτω κατασκευαζομένων, now these things being thus prepared.* *Κατασκευάζω* is also, *to build* or *construct*. But in our phrase, it means more. It designates not only the *fabrication* of the various utensils above named, but the adaptation of them to their respective purposes, and the arrangement of them in the order which the rites of the sanctuary required.

Εἰς μὲν τὴν πρώτην ἐπιτελοῦντες, the priests, performing the services, entered continually into the outer tabernacle. *Πρώτην*, that which is *first* approached, i. e. *outer*, as in v. 2 above. *Λατρείας, public religious services;* see on v. 1 above. *Διαπαντός, every day, without intermission, constantly and often.* This the priest did, to make the morning and evening oblations and sacrifices; and also to present the private offerings of individuals. *Μὲν* is the usual sign of the *protasis* of a sentence here; to which *δέ*, in the *apodosis*, v. 7, corresponds. *Μέν*, in such a case, is incapable of a translation that corresponds with its use in the original. It is easy to see, that there is not only a correspondence between the two parts of the sentence, above mentioned, but also an antithesis between them.

7. *Εἰς δὲ τὴν δευτέραν ὁ ἀρχιερεύς, but into the second* [viz. *σκηνήν*, tabernacle, apartment], *the high priest only* [entered], *once in a year;* comp. Lev. 16: 2. *Δευτέραν* implies *σκηνήν*. *Ἅπαξ* means either simply *once*, as *ἅπαξ καὶ δίς, once and again;* or it means *once only, once for all;* which is the meaning of it here, and in several other passages of this epistle. *Τοῦ ἐνιαυτοῦ* is the genitive of time; the genitive being commonly used in order to designate the time *when*, or *how often*. On the great day of atonement, it appears that the high priest went thrice into the inner sanctuary, Lev. 16: 12, 14, 15; to which may be added once more, in order to bring out the golden censer; which accords well with the Jewish tradition, viz. that the high priest entered the sanctuary *four* times, on the great day of expiation.

Οὐ χωρὶς αἵματος, not without blood. See Lev. 16: 14, 15, by which it appears, that the blood of a young bullock, Lev. 16: 3, and of a goat, was brought into the most holy place, by the high priest, on the great day of atonement, and there sprinkled seven times upon the mercy seat and before it.

Ὃ προσφέρει ἀγνοημάτων, which he presented for his own sins, and for those of the people. See Lev. 16: 6, 11, 14—16. *Προσφέρει* designates the act of presenting the blood before the Lord, as indicated in Lev. 16: 14—16. That the priest was to make atonement for himself, as well as for the people, is expressly declared in the verses above referred to. *Ἀγνοημάτων* Wahl renders, *sins of ignorance.* But plainly it is not necessarily limited to this confined sense. It means, *fault, error, sin,* generally considered. So in Judith 5: 20. Sirach 23: 2. 51: 19. Tobit 3: 3. I Macc. 13: 39. The LXX have sometimes used it to express the Hebrew מִשְׁגֶּה, from שָׁגָה *to err.* In Lev. 4: 2, 13, 22, 27, sins בִּשְׁגָגָה, *through precipitancy,* are mentioned, and atonement is directed to be made for them, by sprinkling blood before the mercy seat, Lev. 4: 6, 17. But this mode of making atonement, and this limitation of the kind of offences, for which it was to be made in this peculiar way, seem to have been afterwards changed, and limited in a different way, on the occasion of the death of the sons of Aaron, Lev. 10, 1, 2. 16: 1, 2. It would seem, from Lev. IV., as if the sins בִּשְׁגָגָה had a special atonement made for them, in the inner sanctuary, *without limitation* as to the number of times that the high priest might go there. But Lev. 16: 2 *restricted* this custom; so that atonement for sin of any kind was made, before the mercy seat, only *once* in a year, agreeably to Ex. 30: 10.

8. *Τοῦτο δηλοῦντος ὁδόν, the Holy Spirit signifying by this, that the way to the most holy place was not yet laid open.* The holy Spirit here mentioned, is that Spirit which guided the ancient prophets; which taught Moses what arrangements to make for the service of God; and which signified, by these arrangements, what the apostle here affirms. *Τοῦτο* I construe with *διά* understood, viz. *by this;* so Ernesti and Dindorf, *his rebus;* Storr, *wodurch, whereby.*

Τὴν τῶν ἁγίων ὁδόν means, *the way to the heavenly* or *upper sanctuary.* Through Jesus only, Jews and Gentiles have free access, at all times, to the mercy seat of heaven; comp. Eph. 2: 18.

Heb. 4: 16. This way was before obstructed by numerous ceremonial rites, and limited as to times and persons. Of necessity such was the case.

Ἔτι τὴν πρώτης σκηνῆς ἐχούσης στάσιν, while the first tabernacle had a standing; i. e. so long as the Jewish dispensation lasted. *Πρώτης σκηνῆς* is here used, in the general or unlimited sense, for the tabernacle or temple with its services.

9. *Ἥτις παραβολὴ τὸν ἐνεστηκότα,* '*which* [has been] *a type down to the present time. Παραβολή* means, *symbol, similitude, image*, i. e. symbolical representation of any thing; which is also the meaning of *τύπος*. But in the English language, *type* is used not for similitude merely, but for something, under the ancient covenant, which was specially *designed*, on the part of God, to be a symbol of some person or event, that was to exist or take place under the new one. Here, the preceding verse shews that the ancient tabernacle or temple, was designed by the Holy Spirit to be a symbol, expressive of some important truths that had relation to the New Testament dispensation. Of course, the rendering of *παραβολή* by *type*, is appropriate to express the idea intended to be conveyed by the writer. *Εἰς τὸν ἐνεστηκότα, down to the present time; εἰς, ad, usque ad*, see Wahl on *εἰς*, 2. a.

Καθ' ὃν δῶρα λατρεύοντα, in which both oblations and sacrifices are presented, that cannot fully accomplish what is needed for the worshipper, in respect to his conscience. Καθ' ὅν, in which, during which, viz. time; see Wahl on *κατά*, no. 2. *Δῶρά τε καὶ θυσίαι* means, *offerings of every kind*, which were presented to God. For *τελειῶσαι*, see on *τελείωσις*, 7: 11. The meaning is, 'To render the mind of the worshipper secure of pardon for sin, and to produce that quiet which was connected with a well grounded persuasion of this, and that moral purification which must accompany it.' We have no one word to express all this in English. I have come as near to it as I am able to do, in the version which I have given.

The whole verse shews very plainly, that our epistle was written while the temple rites were still practised; consequently, before A. D. 70. But by the phrase, *τὸν καιρὸν τὸν ἐνεστηκότα*, the writer particularly alludes to the age then present, in which the new or Christian dispensation had begun. The whole sentence is as much as to say, 'The Jewish ritual, from the commencement

of it down to the present moment, has never been, and still is not, any thing more than a *type* of the Christian dispensation, which has already commenced. All its oblations and sacrifices were ineffectual, as to removing the penalty due to sin in the sight of heaven, or procuring real peace of conscience.

10. *Μόνον ἐπὶ βρώμασι . . . ἐπικείμενα, the ordinances of an external nature had respect only to meats, and drinks, and divers ablutions, enjoined until the time of reformation.* A passage very difficult in respect to its grammatical construction. Many writers have referred *δικαιώματα* to the *δῶρα καὶ θυσίαι*, mentioned in the preceding verse; and then have found difficulty enough, (as well they might), in accounting for it how *oblations* and *sacrifices* could consist in meats, and drinks, and *various ablutions*. To me it seems quite evident, that v. 10 is designed to signify something *additional* to that which is mentioned in v. 9; although the construction is asyndic, i. e. *καί* is omitted before *μόνον*. *Ἐπὶ βρώμασι βαπτισμοῖς*, I understand as a clause qualifying *δικαιώματα*, i. e. it stands in the place of an adjective designating wherein the *δικαιώματα* consisted; while *σαρκός* supplies the place of another adjective, denoting to what the *δικαιώματα* had relation, viz. to the *flesh* or *external part* of man. *Meats* and *drinks* have respect to that which was clean and unclean, under the Jewish dispensation; and not (as some critics interpret the words) to the meats and drinks offered to the Lord. Most evidently, *βαπτισμοῖς* refers to the ceremonial ablutions of the Jews, which had respect to external purification; and *βρώμασι καὶ πόμασι* seem plainly to respect the same kind of purity. Besides, all this agrees perfectly with the scope of the writer. He had denied that the penalty, due to sin in the sight of God, could be removed by any of the *temple offerings*, v. 9; and in this verse, he denies that the moral expiation required could be effected, by any or all of the rites pertaining to *external purification*. Consequently, there was, according to him, nothing in the Jewish ritual, which could effect an atonement such as the sinner needed.

Μέχρι καιροῦ διορθώσεως ἐπικείμενα, sc. *ἦσαν*. This clause, many interpreters have placed first in order, in the verse, in the translations which they have made; but this is unnecessary. It must be admitted, that the construction in this case is very difficult, and far from being clear. The *intention* of the writer seems

to be the best guide ; for, interpret as you please, the grammatical difficulties are about the same. I regard the whole, in this simple light. Vs. 8 and 9 mention the tabernacle, (which of course includes the temple, for the latter was only a substitute of the former), and declare that the same, with all its apparatus and rites connected with it, was only a *παραβολή*, i. e. *a symbol* of something real and ultimate, under the new dispensation. Two particulars, or rather, two classes of things, belonging to the ancient ritual, now seem to strike the writer's mind. First, the *δῶρα καὶ θυσίαι* offered to God, v. 9 ; and secondly, the various meats and drinks, distinguished into clean and unclean, to which men under the Levitical law must have respect, and the divers ablutions which they must practise. "The ordinances pertaining to the flesh," says he, "which respect only meats, and drinks, and divers ablutions, are imposed until the time of reformation," i. e. they are all of a temporary nature, and therefore are plainly to be abolished. I regard the last part of this affirmation, viz. that which asserts the *temporary* (and therefore inadequate) nature of meats and drinks and ablutions, as corresponding with the *μὴ δυνάμεναι κατὰ συνείδησιν τελειῶσαι τὸν λατρεύοντα* of the 9th verse. Thus, both together declare the inadequacy and temporary nature of the ancient ritual, and lead the mind of the reader to expect a new one ; which the writer goes on immediately to propose, in v. 11.

Those who have referred *δικαιώματα ἐπικείμενα* to *δῶρα καὶ θυσίαι*, have been greatly perplexed in adjusting the reading of the word *ἐπικείμενα* ; for in v. 9, we have *δυνάμεναι* (fem.) referring to *θυσίαι*. They propose that we should either read *δυνάμεναι—ἐπικείμεναι*, or else *δυνάμενα—ἐπικείμενα*, so as to make them agree. But all this difficulty arises from connecting *δικαιώματα* with that to which it does not belong ; as we have seen above.

Most Codices and versions read *δικαιώμασι*, instead of *δικαιώματα* ; but the latter is preferred by Knapp and others, and admitted to be of equal or nearly equal authority, by Griesbach ; and it seems to me to make better sense, and to afford a more easy construction, than *δικαιώμασι*.

Καιροῦ διορθώσεως plainly means, *the time of the gospel dispensation*, called *χρόνων ἀποκαταστάσεως*, in Acts 3: 21. Comp. Mal. 3: 1. 4: 5, 6. Is. 66: 22. 65: 17. 51: 16.

Thus much for the description of the earthly tabernacle and its sacred utensils, together with an exhibition of the inefficacy of the whole in respect to meeting the wants of sinners, and also an avowal of their temporary nature. They were intended only as the introduction to a new and better dispensation. Μέν, in v. 1, is the sign of *protasis*, and is the correlate of δέ in v. 10, where the *apodosis* begins. All that follows v. 1, on to v. 10, is only a particular description of what is mentioned in general terms in v. 1, and is subjoined for the sake of illustration and impression. V. 10 is plainly the sequel to v. 1, and nearly related to it.

The writer now proceeds to show, that the tabernacle in which Christ officiates, is οὐ χειροποίητος, not κοσμικός, like that of the Jews. The antithesis between the old and new tabernacles, their services, and the respective efficacy of them, is carried on, by the apostle, through the remainder of chap. IX., and down to chap. X. 19.

11. *Χριστὸς δὲ παραγενόμενος ἀγαθῶν, but Christ being come, the high priest of future blessings.* Χριστὸς . . . παραγενόμενος is nominative to the verb εἰσῆλθε in v. 12.

Ἀρχιερεὺς τῶν μελλόντων ἀγαθῶν, lit. *a high priest of good things future*, i. e. *of future blessings.* The meaning is, plainly, 'The high priest, who procures future blessings.' The principle of interpretation is the same that is adopted in such phrases as the following; viz. *the God of peace*, i. e. who procures or bestows peace; *the God of consolation*, i. e. who bestows consolation; *the God of grace*, i. e. who bestows grace; ἄρτος τῆς ζωῆς, i. q. ἄρτος τὴν ζωὴν διδούς, etc. Christ is here called, *the high priest who procures future blessings*, by way of comparison with the Jewish high priest, who was μεσίτης (8: 6), or ἔγγυος (7: 22), between God and the people, and was the medium through which blessings were procured from God.

Διὰ τῆς μείζονος τῆς κτίσεως, through a greater and more perfect temple, not made with hands, that is not of this [*material*] *creation.* Σκηνή here, as in v. 2, most probably means, *the outer apartment* or *court* only of the heavenly temple. So we must understand it, if we render διά *through*, as the best commentators and lexicographers do, in this case. But to give it *material* form and shape, would be nothing less than to make it χειροποίητος; although the writer of our epistle expressly says, 'it is οὐ χειροποίητος.' It is unnecessary, then, to inquire precisely what there is, in the heavenly world, which constituted, *materialiter*, this *greater and more perfect outer sanctuary*, through which Jesus passed, when εἰσῆλθεν ἐφάπαξ εἰς τὰ ἅγια, v. 12. The comparison is made with the high priest of the Jews, who passed through the outer sanctuary, when he entered into the inner one, upon the great

day of atonement. The probability is, that the writer compared, in his own mind, the *visible heavens*, (through which Jesus passed in his ascension on high, 4: 14. 6: 20. 8: 1, 2), with the vail which separated the *outer* sanctuary of the Jewish temple from the *inner* one; the clouds or sky, (which conceal the temple above from our view), being resembled to the vail of the inner temple. Be this as it may, he explicitly declares that he does not mean a *material* sanctuary, visible to the natural eye, and corresponding in this respect to that upon the earth; for he says, it was *οὐ χειροποίητος*. And lest this should not be sufficient to prevent misapprehension, he adds, *οὐ ταύτης τῆς κτίσεως*, i. e. not of *the visible material creation*, or, *not* (like this creation) *visible* and *material;* which is plainly implied by *ταύτης*.

The version of *διά* by Dr. Schulz, (vermöge, *by virtue of*), I am not able to comprehend. In what sense can it be said, that Christ *εἰσῆλθεν ἐφάπαξ εἰς τὰ ἅγια, αἰωνίαν λύτρωσιν εὑράμενος*, BY VIRTUE OF *a greater and more perfect tabernacle, that was not material?* which is the same as to say, 'He entered into the adytum of the tabernacle above, *by virtue of* the same tabernacle.' I do not aver, that this has no meaning; but I readily confess my inability to discover what the meaning is. It would be well for Dr. Schulz, who has appended so many interrogation and exclamation points, to extracts made by him from Storr's version of our epistle, and from his notes upon it, to defend, or at least explain, such a version as that which gives occasion to these remarks.

There is, indeed, another construction of *διά*, in this case, which, if it might be applied, would give a meaning that is tolerable. *Διά* is often put before the genitive of a noun which indicates the *manner*, or the *circumstances*, in which any thing exists, or takes place, or is effected; as all the lexicons will shew. In 2 Cor. 5: 10, the apostle says, "We must all appear before the judgment seat of Christ, in order that every one may receive *τὰ διὰ σώματος*, [according to] *the things done* IN *the body*." But strictly considered, *διά* does not signify *place* here; for *διὰ σώματος* means, *in a corporeal condition*. Now, if we render the phrase in Heb. 9: 11 thus, *in a greater and more perfect temple*, we make *διά* indicate the *place where* simply. To render it thus, I find no sufficient authority; for *διά* is used only to denote the place *through which*, or *by which* one passes. See Wahl, *διά* I. 1. a. And besides, the *circumstances*,

which attended Christ's going into the most holy place, are noted in v. 12, so that it is hardly to be expected that they are to be found here. There, *διά* is used in a way that is not at all uncommon; e. g. 'Christ entered the eternal sanctuary, *οὐ δι' αἵματος τράγων καὶ μόσχων*, but *διὰ τοῦ ἰδίου αἵματος*.' I cannot see, therefore, how *διὰ μείζονος καὶ τελειοτέρας σκηνῆς* can be construed in the way of indicating *the circumstances in which*, or *the means by which*, Christ entered the eternal sanctuary. Of course, *διά*, in the case under consideration, must, after all, be construed *through*; and be understood as having reference to the passage *through* the *πρώτη σκηνή*, in order to enter the *δευτέρα σκηνή*.

12. *Οὐδὲ δι' αἵματος . . . τὰ ἅγια, not with the blood of goats and of bullocks, but with his own blood, he entered once for all into the sanctuary.* The Jewish high priest, on the great day of atonement, carried with him into the inner sanctuary, first, the blood of a bullock, and sprinkled it upon the mercy seat, Lev. 16: 14; then, the blood of a goat, which he also sprinkled upon the mercy seat, Lev. 16: 15. Christ did not carry with him the blood of bullocks and goats, into the heavenly sanctuary, in order to make atonement; but he presented his own blood there, in order to make expiation. But this is not to be understood *literally*; for as the sanctuary itself was *οὐ ταύτης τῆς κτίσεως*, or *οὐ χειροποίητος*, so the Saviour's blood, which was shed upon Calvary, was not *literally* taken and carried by him into the heavenly temple. All that is *material*, is only a figure or emblem of that which is *spiritual* or *heavenly*. That *διά* before *αἵματος* means *with*, *cum*, בְּ, is quite clear from the nature of the case, and from comparison with Lev. 16: 14, 15. 2 Cor. 2: 4. Rom. 2: 27. 14: 20. 8: 25. Heb. 12: 1. *Δέ* is adversative, *but*, when it follows a negative particle, as *οὐδέ* is here. *Ἐφάπαξ* means here, *once for all, once only*.

Αἰωνίαν λύτρωσιν εὑράμενος, obtaining eternal redemption. *Εὑράμενος* is not an Attic form of the 1 aor. middle. It seems to be an Alexandrine form, made after the analogy of the 2 aor. *εὗρα*; see Winer's Gram. § 9. *d*. *Εὑρίσκω* often means, *to obtain* or *acquire* any thing. Here, the act of entering the eternal sanctuary and presenting his own blood, is considered as the means, by which the eternal redemption of sinners is obtained or accomplished. *Λύτρωσις*, in the New Testament, means, *liberation* or *redemption*; i. e. *liberation* from the penalty due to sin, or *redemption* from the

bondage and penalty of sin. It is called *αἰωνίαν*, because the redemption obtained is eternal in its consequences, or because it is liberation from a penalty which is eternal, and introduction to a state of endless happiness. The *λύτρωσις* effected by Christ, needs no repetition; when once made, the consequences are eternal; as we may see in 9: 24—28. 10: 1, 2, 11—14.

13. *Εἰ γὰρ τὸ αἷμα κεκοινωμένους, for if the blood of bulls and of goats, and the ashes of a heifer sprinkling the unclean.* The blood of bulls and of goats, as employed for the purpose of purification or expiation, is described in Lev. 16: 14, 15. It was also shed, on other occasions, as a sin offering, Lev. 1: 2—5, 10, 11. *Ταύρων*, in our verse, corresponds with *μόσχων* in v. 12. Both words mean, a *bullock*, or a *beeve;* and the Septuagint employ both Greek words to translate the Hebrew שׁוֹר and פָּר. E. g. *ταύρος* for שׁוֹר in Gen. 49: 6, and for פָּר in Gen. 32: 16 [15]; *μόσχος* for שׁוֹר in Prov. 15: 17, and for פָּר in Lev. 4: 3—5.

Σποδὸς δαμάλεως κ. τ. λ. See an account of the manner in which these ashes were prepared, in Num. 19: 2—9. In the last verse, the ashes are directed to be kept *for a water of uncleanness*, לְמֵי נִדָּה, i. e. to be mixed with water which was to be sprinkled on the unclean, that they might be purified. It is also called, in the same verse, חַטָּאת, *a sin-offering*, or (as our English version has it) *a purification from sin*, meaning, *a means of purification.* So in Num. 19: 13, 20, the person who had defiled himself, and neglected to have the מֵי נִדָּה sprinkled upon him, is pronounced *unclean.* Storr applies *ῥαντίζουσα* to *αἷμα*, as well as to *σποδός*. But, (setting aside the difficulty of the grammatical construction as to concord), it does not appear, that the sprinkling of blood upon the unclean was a usual part of the Levitical rites of purification. The blood was sprinkled upon the mercy seat, and on the horns of the altar, and poured out before the altar. Nor is there any need of the construction which he adopts; for the sense is unembarassed, if we follow the usual grammatical construction. *Ῥαντίζουσα* is indeed feminine, and *σποδός* masculine. But such anomalies in concord are very common in Hebrew, see Gram. § 189. 5, 6. Besides, as the latter noun here (*δαμάλεως*) is feminine, it happens, as in some other cases of the like nature, that the grammatical concord, as to gender, is regulated by the latter of two nouns in regimen.

Ἁγιάζει καθαρότητα, sanctifies in respect to external purification. *Ἁγιάζει*, used in respect to external rites, denoted that the person rendered *ἁγιαζόμενος*, was *clean* or *purified* from all ritual uncleanness, i. e. that he had performed all the necessary rites of external purification, so that he could draw near to God, as a worshipper, in a regular manner. Thus much, our author avers, was accomplished by the ceremonial rites of the law. If so, then greater efficacy is to be attributed to the sacrifice made by Christ; as he proceeds to declare.

14. *Πόσῳ μᾶλλον ἔργων, how much more shall the blood of Christ, who, in an eternal spiritual nature, offered himself without spot to God, purify our consciences from dead works.* In vs. 11, 12, Christ is represented as entering the heavenly sanctuary, *with his own blood*, in order to expiate the sins of his people, or to procure *λύτρωσιν* for them, i. e. deliverance from the penalty of the divine law. It is, then, in the heavenly world, in the tabernacle *not made with hands*, that the offering of our great high priest is made. There he has presented himself, in his heavenly or glorified state, in his eternal spiritual condition, or, possessed of an eternal spiritual nature, as the victim that had been slain, 10: 10—12. 1: 3. 7: 27. Rev. 5: 9. Eph. 5: 2; and there his blood, that had been shed, is virtually offered to make atonement; not *literally*, but *spiritually*, i. e. in a manner congruous with the spiritual temple in which he ministers.

Nearly to this purpose did Theophylact, long ago, explain this difficult passage. His words are, "*Οὐκ ἀχειρεύς τις προσήνεγκε τὸν χριστὸν, ἀλλ' αὐτὸς ἑαυτόν· καὶ οὐ διὰ πυρὸς, ὡς αἱ δαμάλεις, ἀλλὰ διὰ πνεύματος αἰωνίου, ὥστε καὶ τὴν χάριν καὶ τὴν ἀπολύτρωσιν διαιωνίζειν*, i. e. "no high priest made an offering of Christ, but he of himself; and this, *not by fire*, as the heifers [were offered], but *by an eternal Spirit*, so that he might render grace and redemption eternal." See Excursus XVIII.

Ἑαυτὸν προσήνεγκε. The apostle seems to use *σῶμα, ἑαυτόν*, and *αἷμα*, as equivalent in regard to the sacrifice which Christ offered; see and compare Heb. 1: 3. 10: 10. 9: 12, 14. 10: 19. 9: 26. The reason of these different expressions, may be found in the nature of the Jewish ritual. When the blood of an animal was presented before God, in order to make atonement, the body was also consumed by fire, so that the *whole* was offered in sacrifice.

See Lev. 4: 6—12, 17—21. The use of either of the three words *σῶμα, ἑαυτόν, αἷμα*, as designating the sacrifice of Christ, implies all that would be designated by employing the whole of them; i. e. when his *blood* was shed, his *body* was slain, i. e. *he himself* was slain.

Ἄμωμον, spotless, an evident allusion to the Jewish victims, which were required to be without spot or blemish. No other could be accepted of God. So Christ, who was "holy, harmless, undefiled, and separate from sinners, 7: 26, was *ἄμωμον*, i. e. a *perfect* victim, a *lawful* or *acceptable* one.

Καθαριεῖ τὴν συνείδησιν ἡμῶν ἀπὸ νεκρῶν ἔργων, shall purify our conscience from deadly works. Καθαριεῖ is the Attic future for *καθαρίσει*. *Συνείδησιν* does not mean simply, the conscience as a faculty of the soul, but *the mind* or *conscious power* of man, i. e. the internal or moral man. *Νεκρῶν* in such cases usually means, *deadly*, i. e. having a deadly, destructive, condemning power. This may be the meaning here; and so it is more usually taken, and so I have translated it. But as in v. 13, the writer had made mention of the *ashes of a heifer*, as one of the means of effecting external purification; and since, in Num. 19: 11—19, these ashes are described as particularly intended to cleanse those who had been polluted by the touch of *dead* bodies; may it not be supposed, that there is an allusion in the term *νεκρῶν* here to that fact? *Dead works*, in this sense, would be such as pollute the soul, as dead bodies did the persons of the Jews. *Dead works*, then, may mean, *sinful* works; for it is from the pollution of sin, that the blood of Jesus cleanses.

Εἰς τὸ λατρεύειν θεῷ ζῶντι, so that we may serve the living God; another allusion to the Jewish ritual. Before persons, under the ancient dispensation, could present themselves in the presence of the Lord acceptably, they must have been subjected to ceremonial purification. What this *prefigured*, the blood of Jesus *effects*. It takes away the sinner's moral pollution, i. e. Christ removes the penalty to which he was obnoxious, and sanctifies, by the Spirit, the soul of the penitent sinner; and thus he may draw near to God, and offer him an acceptable service. He is *clean*, in a sense as much higher than the Israelite was, who had purified himself only externally, as the efficacy of Jesus' blood is greater than that of goats and bullocks.

15. *Καὶ διὰ τοῦτο διαθήκης καινῆς κληρονομίας, on this account also, he is the mediator of a new covenant, in order that, his death having taken place for the sins* [committed] *under the former covenant, they who have been called might receive the promised blessing of the eternal inheritance.* A passage about which much difficulty has arisen, and a variety of interpretations been proposed. *Διὰ τοῦτο*, I understand as referring to the sentiment in v. 14. The sentiment stands thus; 'As Jewish sacrifices rendered the offerer externally clean; so the blood of Christ purifies the moral or internal man, and removes the consequences of sin. On this account (*διὰ τοῦτο*), i. e. because the sacrifice of Christ produces an effect such as the Jewish sacrifices did not, he may be justly called the *mediator of a new covenant*, differing greatly from the old.' Comp. Heb. 8: 6—8, 13. 7: 15—19.

Διαθήκης καινῆς μεσίτης means, *the author of a new covenant*, or the *internuntius*, מַלְאָךְ, who (so to speak) negotiated such a covenant between God and man. See Gal. 3: 19, where Moses is called the *μεσίτης* of the former covenant.

'But of what avail,' the Hebrews would very naturally inquire here 'can this *new covenant* be, to all those who have lived in former ages, under the Mosaic dispensation? You affirm that the ritual of the Mosaic law had no power to remove the spiritual penalty of guilt; do then the patriarchs, and prophets, and just men of past ages, still lie under the imputation of the sins which they committed?' By no means, answers the apostle. A new and better covenant than the Mosaic one has been instituted, under which real spiritual pardon for offences is obtained, which enures to them, as well as to us at the present time.

"*Οπως κ. τ. λ. so that the death of Christ having taken place, for redemption from the punishment due to transgressions committed under the ancient covenant, those who have been called might be made partakers of promised eternal blessings. Θανάτου* means, *the death of Christ. Τῶν παραβάσεων* is governed in the genitive by force of *ἀπό* in composition with *λύτρωσιν*; and it means here, the *effects of transgression*, i. e. punishment, penalty; just as the Hebrew חַטָּאת and עָוֹן mean, not only *sin*, but the *penalty* due to it. *Οἱ κεκλημένοι* (like *ἐκλεκτοί*) means, those who are *called, invited*, viz. to an actual participation of the heavenly inheritance. It is of course understood, that only those who are pious have such an in-

heritance *promised* to them. Comp. *κλήσεως ἐπουρανίου μέτοχοι*, in Heb. 3: 1. *Οἱ κεκλημένοι* here refers to just men, of the times which preceded the gospel dispensation or new covenant; as the antecedent member of the verse clearly shews. *Τῆς αἰωνίου κληρονομίας*, as a genitive, depends on *ἐπαγγελίαν*, not on *κεκλημένοι*, although such a separation is somewhat unusual; see on v. 16, *θάνατον διαθεμένου*. *Ἐπαγγελίαν* is best translated here, as in 6: 12, 15, 17. 10: 36. 11: 13. etc., *promised blessings*, or *proffered good*. The inheritance is called eternal (*αἰωνίου*), because the blessings procured by a Saviour's blood, for those who lived under the ancient dispensation, are of a spiritual eternal nature; see v. 12. Such blessings could not be attained by any of the rites of the old covenant; it is only by virtue of what is done under the new, by Jesus, that the ancient worthies came to the possession of them.

The sentiment which this verse contains, respecting the efficacy of atoning blood in regard to the sins of preceding ages, has an exact parallel in Rom. 3: 25, where the blood of Christ is declared, by Paul, to have procured *τὴν πάρεσιν τῶν προγεγονότων ἁμαρτημάτων, the remission of sins committed in preceding times*; as is plain from the antithesis, *τῷ νῦν καιρῷ*, in the following verse. Both passages compared, form a striking coincidence of a peculiar sentiment, which is no where else so clearly and directly asserted.

16. *Ὅπου γὰρ διαθήκη διαθεμένου, for where there is a testament*, (i. e. where a testament becomes fully so, *ἰσχύει, is valid*,) *the death of the testator must take place*. The occasion of here introducing *διαθήκη*, in the new sense of *testament*, is stated in the summary prefixed to chap. 4: 14, and need not be again repeated. The whole comparison of *testaments* (*διαθῆκαι*) among men, which confer a valid title to an *inheritance*, vs. 16, 17, most evidently springs from the mention of Christ's *death*, in the preceding verse, and of the confirmation thereby of the believer's title to a heavenly *inheritance*. It is as much as to say, 'Brethren, regard it not as strange, that the death of Christ should have given assurance of promised blessings to believers—should have ratified the new *διαθήκη*, of which he is the author; other *διαθῆκαι* are ratified by the death of their respective testators, and only in this way.' And then, he goes on to shew, that even the ancient covenant, though it could not be called a *διαθήκη*, in all respects, so well as

the new one, still was ratified in a manner not unlike the new one, viz. by blood, the emblem of death, vs. 18—22.

As the mode of illustration or comparison, in vs. 16, 17, depends entirely on the sense of the *Greek* word *διαθήκη*, and is not at all supported by any meaning of the Hebrew בְּרִית, it must be plain, that our epistle was originally written in Greek, and not in Hebrew, as some of the ancient, and a few of the modern, critics have supposed.

Φέρεσθαι, in the sense of *intervening, happening, taking place*, (which must necessarily be attached to it here), has no exact parallel, that I can find, either in classic or sacred usage. It is, as to such a meaning, a true *ἅπαξ λεγόμενον*.

If the reader finds any difficulty in admitting, in v. 15, the wide separation of *ἐπαγγελίαν* and *κληρονομίας*, he will now perceive a separation of the same nature, in respect to *θάνατον* and *διαθεμένου*, about the relation of which no possible doubt can be rationally entertained.

17. *Διαθήκη γὰρ ἐπὶ νεκροῖς βεβαία, for a testament is valid, in respect to those who are dead.* *Ἐπί* is not unfrequently employed to denote *after*, viz. in respect to *time*: e. g. Acts 11: 19, *ἐπὶ Στεφάνῳ, after the time of Stephen*, as Wahl renders it; and so Mark 6: 52, *ἐπὶ τοῖς ἄρτοις, after the loaves*, i. e. the miraculous feeding of several thousands with them. So in Phil. 3: 12, *ἐφ' ᾧ*, i. e. *ex quo tempore*, as Brettschneider renders it. But these cases are not altogether clear. In classic authors, however, *ἐπὶ τουτοῖς* means, *postea*; so *ἐπὶ τυφλῷ τῷ Δανδάμιδι, after Dandamis became blind*, Lucian in Tox. See Vigerus, p. 620. Matthiae, § 584. In accordance with this usage, many critics have translated the phrase under consideration thus; *a testament is valid after men are dead*, or, *after death*. This, no doubt, gives the general *sentiment* of the passage; but, after all, the explanation of *ἐπὶ νεκροῖς* in this way, is somewhat forced, and I prefer that given in the translation, which conveys the same sense, and is not exposed to any doubts with regard to *usage*.

Ἐπεὶ διαθέμενος, since it is of no avail, while the testator is living. *Μήποτε* is stronger than the simple negative *μή*; and one might well translate, *since it is of no avail at all.* *Ἰσχύει*, here first expressed, seems to be implied after *διαθήκη*, in v. 16.

The amount of the comparison in vs. 16, 17, is, as before stat-

ed, that as διαθῆκαι among men are ratified by death, so did the death of Christ, (which the writer had just mentioned, v. 15), ratify the new διαθήκη which he had made, and give a valid title to the heirs, who were to receive the inheritance.

18. *"Οθεν οὐδ' ἐγκεκαίνισται, whence, neither the first [διαθήκη] was ratified without blood.*

"Οθεν, whence, i. e. seeing that a διαθήκη must be ratified by the death of the testator, and that the new διαθήκη has been ratified by the *death* of Christ, so as to make sure the *inheritance* to believers, v. 15; therefore ἡ πρώτη etc. The meaning is, that since the *new testament* (καινὴ διαθήκη) was, like other testaments, to be rendered valid by the death of the testator, therefore the παλαιὰ διαθήκη, בְּרִית רִאשׁוֹן, which was the prototype and emblem of the new testament, was itself confirmed, and all the apparatus attached to it consecrated, by blood, the emblem of death. The writer does not mean to say, that διαθήκη, in the sense of *testament*, can be appropriately used to designate the ancient covenant; but he means to aver, that as the καινὴ διαθήκη could be appropriately enough called so, and as the death of Christ was to sanction it, therefore the ancient διαθήκη prefigured this, by the use of consecrating blood. In other words, as almost every thing attached to the παλαιὰ διαθήκη was consecrated to God and rendered acceptable to him, by being sprinkled with blood, and the διαθήκη itself was ratified in the same way; so, under the καινὴ διαθήκη, the blood of Christ only consecrates all things and renders them acceptable to God, and his death has fully ratified the διαθήκη which he made.

The resemblance between the ancient διαθήκη and the new one, is plainly not *entire*. Moses, the μεσίτης of the ancient one, did not ratify it by his death; for his death is never represented by the Scriptures in such a light. But as the new διαθήκη was, in respect to the death of its μεσίτης, to differ from the old one; so, (our author means to say), the old διαθήκη, which was in its nature typical or emblematical, did prefigure this very thing, by the use of blood; i. e. the old *covenant* resembled the new *testament*, as much as the nature of the case permitted.

Πρώτη agrees with διαθήκη understood. Ἐγκεκαίνισται, *to initiate, to consecrate, to dedicate*, i. e. by appropriate rites, to declare a thing which is already completed to be now ready for its

uses, and to devote or dedicate it to those uses. The sprinkling of blood upon the book of the law, and upon the people, was the rite performed by Moses, when he consecrated the book of the law as their statute book, and them as publicly and solemnly bound to observe its precepts.

19. *Λαληθείσης γὰρ πάσης τῷ λαῷ, for when all the commandment, according to the law, had been recited by Moses to all the people.* The *πάσης ἐντολῆς*, to which reference is here made, are the statutes contained in Ex. xx—xxiii. These Moses first recited *memoriter* to the people, after they had been communicated to him by the Lord, at Sinai, Ex. 24: 3. He then wrote them down, Ex. 24: 4, and afterwards, on occasion of solemnly renewing the covenant on the part of the people to obedience, he again recited them from the book of the law (סֵפֶר הַבְּרִית), Ex. 24: 7. *Κατὰ νόμον* most probably means here, *according to the written law*, i. e. just as they were in the book of the law. But *νόμον* may refer to a command which Moses received, to communicate to the people the laws given to him, although this command is only *implied*, but not expressed in the Scripture; in which case the meaning would be, that *agreeably to the divine command*, Moses read all the law to the assembled nation.

Λαβὼν τὸ αἷμα . . . ἐῤῥάντισε, taking the blood of bullocks and of goats, with water and scarlet wool and hyssop, he sprinkled both the book and all the people. This passage has occasioned no small perplexity to commentators; inasmuch as Moses, in his history of renewing the covenant of the people, in Ex. xxiv., has said nothing of the blood of goats; nothing, of the water and scarlet wool and hyssop; nothing, of sprinkling the book of the law with blood. Whence then did the writer obtain these circumstances? That they were not matters of new revelation to him, seems pretty evident; for he plainly makes an appeal to circumstances, which he takes it for granted are well known to the Hebrews whom he addresses, and about which, if he were to commit an error of statement, all his readers would be revolted.

1. *The blood of goats.* In Ex. 24: 5, it is said that Moses *sent young men, who offered burnt offerings* (עֹלֹת), *and sacrificed sacrifices, peace offerings* (זְבָחִים שְׁלָמִים) *to Jehovah, even bullocks*, (פָּרִים). Now, although *goats* are not mentioned here, yet it is quite probable, that the עֹלֹת on this occasion were goats; for עֹלָה

is a *holocaust*, i. e. an offering *entirely* consumed by fire; while the שְׁלָמִים were mostly eaten by the offerers. That goats were used for all kinds of sacrifices, as well as bullocks, is quite evident from mere inspection of the Levitical law. E. g. *goats* are named as an עֹלָה, Lev. 1: 10. 4: 24, 28 et alibi. It is altogether probable, then, that the holocausts or עֹלוֹת, mentioned in Ex. 24: 5 as offered on the occasion of renewing the covenant, were *goats*; and were of course understood by a Jewish reader to be such, inasmuch as the שְׁלָמִים only are affirmed to have been *bullocks*.

2. *The water, scarlet wool, and hyssop.* That water was used as well as blood, in order to sprinkle various things, is clearly implied in Lev. 14: 4—7 compared with Lev. 14: 49—52. Num. 19: 18. Ps. 51: 7. Ezek. 36: 25. The scarlet wool, (שְׁנִי תוֹלַעַת *scarlet*), was connected with a branch of hyssop (אֵזוֹב), in order to make a convenient instrument for receiving and sprinkling the blood and water. It is not, indeed, expressly mentioned in Ex. XXIV.; but it is doubtless implied; for this was the common instrument by which the rite of sprinkling was performed.[8] So in Ex. 12: 7, direction is simply given to sprinkle the door posts of the Israelites with blood; and afterwards, in v. 22, it is mentioned, that this was to be done *with a bunch of hyssop*. So in Lev. 14: 4—7, the שְׁנִי תוֹלַעַת, i. e. ἔριον κόκκινον, and the hyssop, are mentioned as employed in the office of sprinkling; and again, in Lev. 14: 49—52. The hyssop is also mentioned in Num. 19: 18. Ps. 51: 7. It may well be presumed, that the reason why the writer of our epistle, and the Hebrews of his time, supposed that Moses made use of the water and hyssop and scarlet wool, in the lustration of the people, when the covenant was renewed, was because these were employed in the lustrations where sprinkling was performed, on other occasions. The convenience of the instrument in question, and the nature of the case, would very naturally lead to such an opinion; and who can doubt that it is well grounded?

3. *The book of the law.* Because nothing is said, in Ex. 24: 3—8, respecting the sprinkling of the book, many commentators, e. g. Grotius, Bengel, Koppe, Storr, and others, construe αὐτό τε τὸ βιβλίον with λαβὼν τὸ αἷμα, i. e. *taking the blood and also the book of the law.* So far as such a construction of the particle τέ itself is concerned, this might perhaps be allowed; for τέ is sometimes employed, when it is not preceded by καί or δέ, in the

clause immediately antecedent; as in Acts 2: 33. To justify the method of interpretation now in question, Storr appeals to Heb. 9: 1 and 12: 2. But in the former case, τέ is preceded by καί; and the latter is a case where two verbs are connected. But in our verse, καί follows βιβλίον, and seems necessarily to connect it with πάντα τὸν λαόν. But to say of Moses, λαβὼν πάντα τὸν λαόν, will not be contended for. Michaelis, Heinrichs, Dindorf, Ernesti, and others, agree with the interpretation which I have given. Indeed, καί and τέ seem to be as necessarily related here, as *et* and *que* are in Latin; and, in fact, they *commonly* sustain the same relation to each other. As to manuscripts, only one omits καί after βιβλίον; and we are obliged, therefore, by the laws of criticism to retain it, whatever difficulties it may occasion to the interpreter.

In regard to the fact itself, viz. that Moses did sprinkle the book with blood, no intimation of it is given in Ex. 24: 3—8. Yet nothing can be more probable, than that such was the fact. Aaron, and his sons, and their garments, were sprinkled with blood, when consecrated to the priests' office, Ex. 29: 19—21. The blood of sacrifices was sprinkled upon the altar, Ex. 29: 16. Lev. 1: 5, 11. 3: 2, 13; also before the vail of the sanctuary, Lev. 4: 6, 17; comp. Lev. 6: 27. 7: 14. 8: 15, 19, 24, 30. 9: 12, 18, et alibi. Philo, (de Vita Mosis B. p. 675), has a passage which speaks of all the various apparatus of the tabernacle being anointed with holy oil, and the vestments of the priests being sprinkled with blood. So Josephus, also, speaks of sprinkling the garments of Aaron and his sons with αἵματος τῶν τεθυμένων, *the blood of the slain beasts*, and with spring water, and holy chrism. Lib. V. 6. 6. p. 334. edit. Havercamp. All this serves to shew how common this rite of sprinkling with blood was, in the Jewish ritual; so common, that the writer of our epistle seems, with those whom he addressed, to have considered it a matter of course, that when the people were sprinkled with blood, at the time of renewing their covenant to keep the precepts contained in the book of the law, Ex. 24: 8, the book itself, like all the sacred apparatus of the temple, was also sprinkled in like manner. Nothing could be more natural The people were consecrated to observe the statutes of the book; and the book was consecrated, as containing that sacred code of laws which they were bound to obey.

If however, after all, one is not satisfied that Paul drew his con-

clusions from the analogies and probabilities just stated, he may easily suppose that tradition among the Jews had preserved the remembrance of the particulars described in our verse, on account of the very solemn and important nature of the transaction, with which they are connected. It would be easy to suppose, with some commentators, that these particulars were suggested in a miraculous way, by the Holy Spirit, to the mind of the writer. But this solution of the difficulty is not a probable one; because the writer evidently touches upon circumstances here, which he takes it for granted his readers will at once recognize and admit. If so, then these things must have already been matters of *common opinion* among the Hebrews; and consequently were not now first suggested to the writer of our epistle, in a *miraculous* way. At all events, there can be no serious difficulty in the case. The fact that Ex. 24: 3—8 does not mention the particulars in question, can be no more proof that they did not take place, than the fact that the Evangelists have not recorded the words of Christ, "It is more blessed to give than to receive," would prove that he did not utter them. Whether Paul and the Hebrews knew these things by tradition, or believed them from analogical reasoning, cannot be important. Enough that they were facts, and were appealed to as such by the writer, with full confidence that they would be recognised by his readers.

To illustrate the principle, *de minimis non curat lex*, it may be remarked, that Paul says simply, *λαβὼν τὸ αἷμα*; Moses, that "he took *half* of the blood, Ex. 24: 6." But surely, if he did the latter, he did the former. Such expressions, no where either in sacred or profane writers, are to be tortured, in order to extract from them a *metaphysical* exactness; *verba—ne resecanda ad vivum*.

In the like manner, I interpret *πάντα τὸν λαόν*. How, it has been asked, could he sprinkle three millions of people, with the blood of a few goats and bullocks? In such a way I would answer, as "*all* Judea and Jerusalem went out to John, to be baptized of him in the river Jordan, *confessing their sins*, Matt. 3: 5 seq." Must we now understand by this, that all the infants, the *non compotes mentis*, mutes, the sick, the infirm, the aged, all females, or literally *all* adult males, repaired to John, to be baptized, and did *all* (infants and mutes with the rest) *confess* their sins to him?

If not, then there is no difficulty in construing *πάντα τὸν λαόν*, in the case now under consideration. *Moses sprinkled blood on the multitude of the people*, I take to be the simple meaning of the writer; not that all and every individual was actually and personally sprinkled. Some were actually sprinkled; and these, being of the multitude, were representatives of the whole. Nothing is more common than to attribute to a body of men collectively, what belongs, strictly considered, only to certain individuals of that body. Thus what the *government* of this country do, the *Americans* are said to do.

20. *Λέγων· τοῦτο τὸ αἷμα ὁ θεός, saying, This is the blood of the covenant, which God has enjoined upon you.* Another instance, in which the *letter* of the Old Testament is forsaken, and the *sense* merely retained. The original in Ex. 24: 8 is, הִנֵּה דַם־הַבְּרִית אֲשֶׁר כָּרַת יְהוָה עִמָּכֶם, *behold, the blood of the covenant which God has made with you.* But הִנֵּה means, *see here*, or, *see this*, and is equivalent to *τοῦτο* used as a *demonstrative*. The verb כָּרַת is rendered by the Seventy, *διέθετο*; by our author, *ἐνετείλατο*. The reason of this probably is, that בְּרִית in Ex. 24: 8 means, *statutes, laws*, as it evidently refers to the preceding *statutes*, in Ex. xx—xxiii. God *commanded* that the people should observe these; and with reference to this injunction, our author says, *ἐνετείλατο*.

Τὸ αἷμα τῆς διαθήκης means, *the blood by which the covenant*, or, assent on the part of the people to the laws proposed, or rather, their promise to observe them, Ex. 24: 7, *was ratified*. So common was it, among the Hebrews, to ratify engagements by the blood of animals slain, that the usual idiom of the language is, כָּרַת בְּרִית, *to cut a covenant*, i. e. to sanction one by cutting an animal into two pieces, and passing between them. See Gen. 15: 10. 31: 54. Jer. 34: 18. Ephrem Syrus testifies, that the Chaldeans had the same usage, Opp. I. p. 161; as also Hacourt does, in respect to the Arabians, Histoire de Madagascar, p. 98. 360. The meaning of such a transaction seems evidently to be, that the persons who make the engagements, by passing between the dissevered parts of the slain animal, virtually say, 'If we preserve not our engagement faithfully, and without violation, then let us be cut in pieces, like the animal between whose dissevered parts we now pass.' The sprinkling of blood on the people, Ex. 24: 8, was a

solemnity of a similar nature. By it they were also ceremonially purified, and consecrated to God.

21. *Καὶ τὴν σκηνὴν ἐῤῥάντισε, the tabernacle, also, and all the vessels for service, he sprinkled in like manner with blood. Καί,* although a kind of copulative here, still indicates another transaction different from that related in v. 19; for when the people were sprinkled with blood, the tabernacle was not built, neither were the *σκεύη λειτουργίας* yet made. The setting up and consecration of the tabernacle, with its vessels, is related in Ex. XL.; yet nothing is there related of sprinkling them with blood, but only of anointing them with holy oil, Ex. 40: 9—11. In the like manner, the *anointing* only of Aaron and his sons is there spoken of, as a rite preparatory to entering upon the duties of their office in the tabernacle, Ex. 40: 12—15; while nothing is said at all of their being sprinkled with blood. But if we compare Ex. 29: 20, 21 and Lev. 8: 24, 30, we shall see that it is certain, that Aaron and his sons were sprinkled with blood, as well as anointed with oil. In like manner it is probable, that the tabernacle and its furniture were sprinkled with blood, although Moses has not mentioned it in Ex. XL. Josephus says, "Both the tabernacle and the vessels pertaining to it, [Moses sprinkled and purified] with oil prepared as I have described, and with the blood of bulls and rams that were slain, one of each kind alternately, every day, Antiq. III. 8. § 6." This seems to indicate, that Josephus had the same view as Paul, in regard to purifying the tabernacle. The verbs in brackets, in the above translation, are drawn from the preceding clause, where we find *ἔῤῥαινεν ἁφαγνίσας, purifying he sprinkled.* They belong to the sentence here translated, by *implication.*

In regard to the fact itself, we may observe, that it is rendered quite probable from analogy. Then as to a knowledge of it by our author, nothing more is necessary, than the supposition that tradition had conveyed the knowledge of this, as well as of many other facts, down to the time of Paul. The writer evidently appeals to facts, which were believed by the Hebrews in general whom he was addressing; and facts which, although not stated in the Old Testament, are by no means improbable, and which no one surely has it in his power to contradict.

22. *Καὶ σχεδὸν ἐν αἵματι νόμον, indeed, every thing is, according to the law, purified by blood. Καί, imo, vero, yea, indeed.*

Σχεδὸν πάντα, and not *πάντα* absolutely and simply; for some things were purified by *water*, Lev. 16: 26, 28. Num. 31: 24; some by fire and water, Num. 31: 22, 23. But the exceptions were few, in which shedding of blood, or sprinkling of blood, was not required, in order to effect ceremonial purity. See on v. 19.

Καὶ χωρὶς αἱματεκχυσίας οὐ γίνεται ἄφεσις, and without shedding of blood, there is no remission [of sins]. See Lev. 4: 2—6, 13—17, 22—25, 27—30 and 31, 35. Under the Mosaic law, not every transgression could be atoned for; consequently, remission of the penalty which the law inflicted could not, in some cases, be obtained. See Num. 15: 30, 31. It was only he that sinned through a degree of ignorance or inadvertency, who could bring his sin and trespass-offering, Num. 15: 27, 29; for cases of a different nature, comp. Lev. 4: 2, 13, 22, 27. The חַטָּאת and אָשָׁם, *sin* and *trespass*, were atoned for, in a civil and ecclesiastical point of view, by appropriate sacrifices, which bore the like names. But in this case, the remission was only from a temporal penalty or calamity. It was not possible that such sacrifices could atone for sin, as viewed by the righteous governor of the world. Such the nature of the case seems plainly to be; and so the writer of our epistle has expressly declared, in chap. 10: 4. God, as the king and head of the Jewish nation, granted remission of the penalty, which the Jewish law inflicted in many cases, on certain conditions. But this had respect merely to the present world, and not to the accountability of transgressors, before the tribunal of the universe in the world above. Even *temporal* forgiveness, however, could not be obtained *χωρὶς αἱματεκχυσίας*. It was thus, that these *ὑποδείγματα* shadowed forth, to the ancient church, the necessity of atoning blood, which possessed a higher virtue than that of beasts, in order to remove the penalty against sin, that was threatened in respect to a future world. So the writer proceeds to tell us, in the next verse.

23. *Ἀνάγκη οὖν τούτοις, since then the images of heavenly things must needs be purified by such* [rites], *the heavenly things themselves* [must be purified] *by better sacrifices than these.* *Μέν* is here the mere sign of *protasis*. *Τποδείγματα, copies, effigies, images, resemblances, likenesses;* meaning the tabernacle and temple, with all their sacred utensils, etc. See on 8: 5. *Τῶν ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς* means, the *spiritual objects of the heavenly world*, of which the tabernacle, with all its apparatus and services, was only a sym-

bol. See on 8: 5. *Τούτοις* designates such things, i. e. such rites and means of purification, as had been described in the preceding context. *Καθαρίζεσθαι* refers to the ceremonial purification of the temple and its sacred utensils; e. g. of the most holy place, Lev. 16: 15, 16; of the altar, Lev. 16: 18. Ex. 29: 36, 37; of the tabernacle, Lev. 16: 33, 20. This was to be done, because the Israelites, sinful and impure, profaned these sacred things by their approach, Lev. 16: 19. 15: 31. Num. 19: 19, 20. And this being done, God vouchsafed his presence in the tabernacle, and promised to dwell among the Israelites, Ex. 29: 43—46. All this was symbolical of the heavenly sanctuary and sacrifice. God permits sinners to hope for pardon and approach to him, only when they are sprinkled with the atoning blood of Jesus; and what was done on earth as a *symbol*, has been done in the heavenly world in *reality*, i. e. so as actually to procure *spiritual* pardon, and restoration to the divine favour.

Αὐτὰ δὲ τὰ ἐπουράνια . . . ταύτας. *Δέ* is the sign of *apodosis* merely. It may be translated, *therefore, then;* but there is no need of rendering it, as our language does not demand like signs of protasis and apodosis with the Greek. *Ἐπουράνια* means the *σκηνὴ ἀληθίνη, ἣν ἔπηξεν ὁ κύριος*, 8: 2, i. q. *ἡ σκηνὴ οὐ χειροποίητος*, 9: 11. But how could the heavenly tabernacle *καθαρίζεσθαι, be purified?* The grammatical construction of v. 23, certainly requires us to supply this verb in the latter clause, since it is expressed in the former. But the word, of course, can be here used only in a *figurative* manner; for the *ἐπουράνια* are not *impure*. But as God was accessible to offenders, in his sanctuary on earth, only when atoning blood had been offered; so God, in his heavenly sanctuary, is accessible to sinners, only through the blood of Jesus there offered, and there consecrating a new and living way of access to the throne of mercy. It is in this sense, that the writer means to apply *καθαρίζεσθαι*, viz. that of rendering the sanctuary approachable by offenders, and affording assurance of liberty to draw near to God (4: 16), rather than that of direct purification from uncleanness; which could not be predicated of the heavenly sanctuary. It is the *effect* of the purifying blood of Jesus, in regard to giving access to the heavenly sanctuary, which the writer means to compare with the purification of the tabernacle and its utensils; for the most holy place of the earthly tabernacle could

be properly approached by offenders, only when atonement was made.

24. That better sacrifices than those offered on earth by the Jewish priests, were required under the priesthood of Christ, necessarily results from the nature of the sanctuary in which Christ ministers. *Οὐ γὰρ εἰς χειροποίητα ἅγια οὐρανόν; for Christ entered not into a sanctuary made by hands, which is only a copy of the true one, but into heaven itself.* It is the entrance of Christ, as a *priest*, into the heavenly sanctuary, of which the writer is here speaking. That Christ performs the office of priest in the heavenly sanctuary, the writer has already intimated several times; see 9: 9, 11. 8: 1—4. *Ἀντίτυπα copy, image, effigy, form or likeness*, corresponding to the original *τύπος*, shewn to Moses in the mount, 8: 5. *Ἀληθινῶν* means, *that which is real*; i. e. the original or heavenly sanctuary, of which the earthly one is a *mere copy*. In other words, they stand related as substance and shadow or image. The *reality* is in heaven; the *emblem* or *mere similitude* of it, on earth.

Νῦν ἐμφανισθῆναι ἡμῶν, thenceforth to appear before God, in our behalf. Νῦν means, from the point of time when he entered heaven as our high priest, onward indefinitely; and it implies, that his office was continued while the writer was then addressing his readers. *Ἐμφανισθῆναι* means, among other things, *to present one's self before a tribunal*, for the sake of accusing or defending. In the former case, it is followed by *κατά*, e. g. Acts 24: 1. 25: 2, 15; in the latter, it takes *ὑπέρ* after it, as in our text. The usual and full grammatical construction would be *ὥστε ἐμφανισθῆναι*. I have been able to find no similar usage of *ἐμφανίζω*, among the Greeks.

Τῷ προσώπῳ τοῦ θεοῦ, the same as the Hebrew לִפְנֵי אֱלֹהִים, being altogether Hebraistic. The whole comparison is taken from the custom of the Jewish high priest, who, when he entered the most holy place, was said *to appear before God*, or to *draw near to God*, because the presence of God was manifested over the mercy seat, in the holy of holies, and God was represented, and was conceived of by the Jews, as sitting enthroned upon the mercy seat. Now as the high priest appeared before God, in the Jewish temple, and offered the blood of beasts for expiation, on the great day of atonement, in behalf of the Jewish nation; so Christ, in the

heavenly temple, enters the most holy place with his own blood (v. 12), to procure pardon (*αἰωνίαν λύτρωσιν*) for us. This is what the writer means, by *ἐμφανισθῆναι τῷ προσώπῳ τοῦ θεοῦ ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν*.

25. But although there is a similitude between the atoning office of Christ and that of the Jewish high priest, yet there is a great difference, in some respects, between his manner of offering expiatory sacrifice, and that of the Levitical priesthood. *Οὐδ' ἵνα πολλάκις ἀλλοτρίῳ, yet not that he may frequently repeat the offering of himself, like the high priest, who, every year, enters into the sanctuary with blood not his own.* This refers to the entrance of the high priest into the sanctuary, on the great day of atonement. *Ἐν αἵματι ἀλλοτρίῳ, with the blood of others*, i. e. with blood not his own; in distinction from the manner in which Christ entered the heavenly sanctuary, which was *with his own blood*, v. 12. Two points of difference, then, are here suggested, between the Jewish offerings and that of Christ; the one, that they were *often* repeated, his was made but *once;* the other, that the high priest presented the *blood of goats and bullocks*, but Jesus, his *own blood*.

26. *Ἐπεὶ ἔδει κόσμου, for then he must needs have often suffered, since the world began.* That is, since the blood of Christ is necessary to make atonement for sin, and to procure pardon for it from the righteous and spiritual Judge of men; and since the blessings, procured by the death of Jesus, must enure as well to the benefit of the ages which preceded his coming, as to those which follow it, (see v. 15 and Rom. 3: 25, 26); it follows, that if his sacrifice had not been of a different nature and value from that of the Jewish priests, it must have been continually repeated, from the very beginning of the world, down to the time in which the writer was addressing his readers. We may of course add, that it must have continued to be repeated down to the end of the world, for the same reason. This passage serves then to shew, that when Heb. 9: 15 and Rom. 3: 25, 26, are construed as having relation to the *retrospective* influence of the death of Christ, no doctrine foreign to the conceptions of our author is introduced; for the verse under consideration is plainly built upon the ground of such a *retrospective* influence.

Νῦν δὲ ἅπαξ πεφανέρωται, but now, at the close of the

[Jewish] *dispensation, he has once for all made his appearance, in order to remove the punishment due to sin by the sacrifice of himself.* Νῦν does not relate particularly to *time* here, but is a particle of opposition, in contradistinction to ἐπεί. Συντελείᾳ τῶν αἰώνων, the close of the Mosaic economy or period. Αἰών singular, and αἰῶνες plural, appear to be sometimes used in the same sense, in the New Testament; like οὐρανός and οὐρανοί, σάββατον and σάββατα, and some other nouns. For the meaning given to αἰών see Wahl's Lex. on the word.

Ἀθέτησις signifies, *putting away, removal, abrogation, annulling*, etc. Ἁμαρτία I understand here, as meaning *the penalty due to sin*; just as the Hebrew חַטָּאת means, *sin*, and *the punishment*, consequences, *of sin*; and עָוֹן means, *iniquity*, and the *punishment* i. e. consequences *of iniquity*. It is true, indeed, that Christ came to save men from the *power*, as well as the *penalty*, of sin; but most evidently his death is here considered, by our author, as an expiatory sacrifice, by virtue of which the consequences of sin, i. e. the punishment due to it, are removed, and the sinner treated as though he were innocent.

Διὰ τῆς θυσίας αὐτοῦ, comp. 1: 3. 2: 14. 7: 27. 9: 12, 14, 15. 10: 5—10.

The whole comparison stands thus. 'As the expiatory sacrifices under the law, which were annually offered, and therefore often repeated, procured remission of the temporal punishment due to offences under the Mosaic dispensation; so the sacrifice of Christ, and the blood which he presents, once for all, in the eternal or heavenly sanctuary, is effectual to procure spiritual pardon for all times and ages, past and to come.' Nothing could exhibit the great superiority of Christ's priesthood over that of the Jewish, in a more striking point of light than this. The latter, by its offerings and atonements, procured only a remission of *temporal* punishment in the *present world*; the former, a remission αἰωνίου λυτρώσεως (Matt. 25: 46) in the *world to come*.

27. Καὶ καθ' ὅσον κρίσις, *for since it is appointed unto men to die once only, and after this* [cometh] *the judgment.* Καθ' ὅσον is sometimes equivalent to καθώς, *since, as*, in this epistle; e. g. 7: 20, comp. v. 22; and here it is plainly the same as ὡς or καθώς. Ἀπόκειται, *repositum est, it is laid up for*, i. e. by divine appointment, *it is reserved for*, or, *it awaits* men, once to die.

The translation gives the meaning, but not with *literal* exactness. Ἅπαξ is here, *once for all, only once;* for the object of this comparison is to shew that as men die *but once*, so Christ, who had a nature truly human, and was in all things made like unto his brethren (2: 17), could die *but once*, (and not oftentimes), in order to atone for sin.

Μετὰ δὲ τοῦτο κρίσις, i. e. men, having *once* died, go after that to a state of reward or punishment, to a final state, in which no more such changes as death makes can be suffered. The clause in question is added to the former part of the verse, in order to shew that dying more than once is impossible, inasmuch as judgment immediately follows, with which is connected the immutable state of men. The implication contained in this verse, viz. that a state of trial in a future world, like to that which is allowed to men in the present world, is not to be expected, seems to be plain.

28. *Οὕτω καὶ ὁ Χριστὸς ἁμαρτίας, so Christ, also, after having once for all offered up himself, in order to bear the sins of many.* The writer had been labouring, in the preceding context, to shew that the offering of Christ needed not, like that of the high priest, to be often repeated. Vs. 27 and 28 are designed to shew that a repetition of the death of Jesus, (who suffered in our nature), would have been inconsistent with the nature which he sustained, and contrary to all analogy. So the author; 'Since men die *but once*, so Christ died or was offered up, *προσενεχθείς, but once.*'

Προσενεχθείς (from *προσφέρω*) is a part. of the 1 aor. passive, and may be rendered, *offered up himself*, or *made an offering of himself*, inasmuch as the 1 aor. pass. frequently has a middle or reflexive sense, particularly when any verb lacks the 1 aor. of the middle voice, Buttmann Gram. § 123. *Προσφέρω* is a very general word in respect to offerings, and designates the action of the person who brings the sacrifice, or of the priest who presents it. As the sacrifice offered to God was first *slain*, and then presented; so the idea of an offering here necessarily involves the idea of the death of the victim offered. It is this implied idea of the death of the victim, that stands in comparison with the *ἅπαξ ἀποθανεῖν* of all men; i. e. as they die but once, so Christ died but once.

Πολλῶν, many, i. e. *all nations* without distinction, Jews and

Gentiles, for ages past and ages to come, vs. 15, 26 and Rom. 3: 25, 26. See the like representation, respecting the universality of the benefits offered through the death of Christ, in Matt. 20: 28. 26: 28. Rom. 5: 15, 19 comp. v. 18. John 6: 51. 3: 16. 1 John 2: 2, etc.

Ἀνενεγκεῖν ἁμαρτίας, to bear the sins, means, *to bear the punishment*, i. e. to suffer the penalty, *due to sin*. See Excursus XIX.

Ἐκ δευτέρου εἰς σωτηρίαν, shall make his appearance, a second time, without a sin-offering, for the salvation of those who wait for him. *Ἐκ δευτέρου* has reference to *ἅπαξ* in the preceding clause. Christ appeared and died *once* for sin; but when he appears *again*, *ἐκ δευτέρου*, it will not be to repeat his sufferings, i. e. to make again an expiatory sacrifice, but for the purposes of bestowing rewards on those, who trust in him and wait for his coming.

Χωρὶς ἁμαρτίας has been variously explained. But it is evident, that the expression has a direct reference to the preceding clause, i. e. either to *προσενεχθείς*, or to *ἀνενεγκεῖν ἁμαρτίας*. In the former case, *ἁμαρτίας*, in our clause, would mean *sin offering*, like חַטָּאת, אָשָׁם, because *προσενεχθείς* means, *he made himself an offering*. The meaning would then be, 'but when Christ again appears, he will not make himself a sin-offering, i. e. his appearance will be *χωρὶς ἁμαρτίας*. So I understand the phrase. But if we construe *χωρὶς ἁμαρτίας*, as referring to *ἀνενεγκεῖν ἁμαρτίας*, then the supplement to the phrase will be *χωρὶς* [*τοῦ ἀνενεγκεῖν*] *ἁμαρτίας*. The meaning of this is, 'Without again suffering the penalty due to sin.' In either way, the sense amounts to about the same; for either method of interpretation makes the writer say, that Christ would no more suffer on account of the sins of men, but that, by dying once, he has perfectly accomplished the redemption of those who trust in him.

Τοῖς αὐτὸν ἀπεκδεχομένοις means, those who, renouncing the world, and resisting all the motives to swerve from Christian hope and faith, which the times presented, patiently wait for the rewards which the Saviour will finally bestow upon his followers. There is a tacit admonition to the Hebrews in this; for it is as much as to say, 'Those only who do thus persevere, will be rewarded.' *Εἰς σωτηρίαν* has reference to the future salvation or blessedness, which Christ will bestow upon his followers, at his second coming.

The insufficiency of the Levitical sacrifices to procure spiritual pardon for sin, and the sufficiency of the sacrifice which Christ had offered, was one of the most important and interesting of all the points, which the writer of our epistle had to discuss. The Hebrews in general placed full confidence in the efficacy of the Levitical sacrifices to purify them from sin, at least, to remove the penalty of it. Every person, who is conscious of sin, and knows that it subjects him to the penalty of the divine law, must naturally feel a deeper interest in the question, *whether* and *how* sin can be pardoned, than in any other. It was very natural for Jews, who had been educated in the full belief of the efficacy of the sacrifices instituted by Moses, to cling to them as the foundation of their dearest and highest hopes, viz. the means of pardon, and restoration to divine favour. It was an attachment to the Jewish ritual, built upon hopes of such a nature, which rendered the Mosaic religion so attractive to the Hebrews, and endangered their adherence to a Christian profession. There was much, too, in the pomp and solemnity of their rites, which served to interest the feelings and delight the fancy of the worshippers. It is on account of the strong attachment, which they cherished for their system of sacrifices and purifications, that our author is so urgent, in shewing that real pardon with God could not be procured by any or all of these means. The blood of Christ only cleanses from sin, and procures acceptance for sinners with God, as their spiritual judge.

Accordingly, in Chap. IX. he declares that the tabernacle, with all its sacred utensils and services, was only an *image* or *symbol* (παραβολή) of what is real and spiritual in the heavenly world, a *copy* merely of the σκηνὴ οὐ χειροποίητος, 9: 9—11, or a mere ὑπόδειγμα τῶν ἐν οὐρανοῖς, 9: 23. The Jewish sacrifices availed for nothing more than *external* purification, 9: 10, 13; while the blood of Christ purified the soul or mind (συνείδησιν) from the uncleanness of sin, and rendered it capable of offering acceptable service to the living God, 9: 14. After adducing various considerations to shew how extensively the rites of the law, which required the exhibition and application of blood, prefigured that atoning blood which Jesus offered to make expiation for sin, and that his death once for all, was sufficient for this purpose, he proceeds, in chap. X., more deeply to impress the great subject of atoning sacrifice by Christ upon the minds of his readers, knowing that very much depended on the conviction which might be attained in respect to this point. Could they be persuaded, that Jesus had himself offered the only sacrifice which made real expiation for sin; and that this, once offered, was an all-sufficient sacrifice; then there could be no rational inducement for them to abandon their spiritual hopes, and return to their confidence in the rites of the Levitical law.

The repetition of this subject, is for the purpose of suggesting some new arguments in order to enforce it; as may be seen in vs. 5—18.

CHAP. X.

1. *Σκιὰν γὰρ ἔχων πραγμάτων, moreover the law, which presented only an imperfect sketch of future blessings, and not a full representation of those things.* Σκιά and εἰκών are related, as the Latin *umbra* and *effigies* are. The former is an *imperfect sketch*, a *mere outline* (as we say), a *slight representation* or *resemblance*; the latter is a picture or image filled out or completed, and made, in all its minuter parts, to resemble the original. Not that these words are always employed with a sedulous attention to these nice shades of signification; but in the case before us they are so, for they are evidently contrasted with each other. The meaning of the writer is, 'The law did not even go so far, as to exhibit a *full image* of future blessings, but only a *slight adumbration*. Ἔχων hav-

ing, containing, possessing, affording, or (ad sensum) *exhibiting, presenting*, so as to accord with the nature of the image which follows.

Νόμος means here, *the sacrificial ritual law*, of which he had before been speaking; the old בְּרִית, *διαθήκη*, which was to be abolished. The whole law of Moses, i. e. the moral code which it contains, is not the subject of consideration or assertion here. *Μελλόντων ἀγαθῶν*, the same as in 9: 11. *Τῶν πραγμάτων*, i. e. *τούτων*, viz. the *future blessings* just before mentioned.

Κατ' ἐνιαυτὸν τελειῶσαι, by the yearly sacrifices themselves, which are continually offered, can never fully accomplish what is needed for those who approach [the altar]. By the *κατ' ἐνιαυτὸν θυσίαις*, the writer means particularly to designate those which were offered on the great day of national atonement; which were considered the most sacred and efficacious of all, inasmuch as the high priest then entered the inner sanctuary, and presented himself before the mercy seat.

Προσφέρουσι, with a nominative not expressed, is equivalent to the passive voice here, as often elsewhere, agreeably to the Hebrew idiom.

Εἰς τὸ διηνεκές, without cessation, continually, i. e. they were repeated each successive year. The word is peculiar to this epistle; and Schneider has omitted it in his Lexicon; but Elian, Appian, Diodorus Siculus, and Symmachus, employ it.

Τοὺς προσερχομένους means, the worshippers who approach the altar, or the temple, or the divine presence in the temple. The sense is for substance the same, whichever of these be understood. For *τελειῶσαι*, see on Heb. 9: 9 and 7: 11. The sentiment of the verse corresponds very exactly with that in 9: 9, 10.

2. *Ἐπεὶ οὐκ ἂν ἐπαύσαντο προσφερόμεναι, for otherwise*, i. e. if the sacrifices could have perfected those who presented them, *would not the offerings have ceased?* To *προσφερόμεναι* most critics subjoin *εἶναι* understood, which would be equivalent to the infinitive *προσφέρεσθαι*, rendering the phrase thus, *They* (i. e. the sacrifices) *had ceased to be offered.*" The sense of the phrase thus explained, is the same that I have given to it. But *προσφερόμεναι* [*θυσίαι*] *ἐπαύσαντο* seems to me more facile than the other construction.

Διὰ τὸ μηδεμίαν κεκαθαρμένους, because the worshippers once for all made clean, would have no longer been conscious of sins. Λατρεύοντας designates those who brought the offerings or sacrifices, and on whose account they were presented to God, i. e. the worshippers. Ἅπαξ denotes here, as in the preceding chapter, *once for all;* the nature of the argument demanding this sense. For if a worshipper, at one time, obtained pardon, or was made clean only in respect to *past* offences, (and surely expiatory sacrifices were offered only with respect to the *past*), this would not prevent the dread of punishment at a future period, when new offences would have been committed. To be purified *once for all*, then, was necessary, in order to quiet the apprehensions of such a worshipper.

Κεκαθαρμένους, purified, atoned for. As καθαρίζω means, in Hebrew Greek, *to make expiation for, to purify by expiatory offering, to pronounce* or *declare one to be pure;* so κεκαθαρμένους of course means, *those atoned for, those for whom expiation is made, those declared to be pure,* or *rendered pure,* and consequently, restored to favour.

Συνειδησιν means not merely, *conscience,* but *consciousness, opinion, judgment, sentiment, apprehension. Συνείδησιν ἁμαρτιῶν* is *an apprehension of the consequences of sin,* or, *a consciousness* that one has subjected himself to them, *a consciousness of guilt.* Ἁμαρτιῶν may mean here, (as often before), *punishment of sin, consequences of sin,* like the corresponding Hebrew חַטָּאת, עָוֹן, פֶּשַׁע; or it may mean, *sin, guilt, transgression.* The writer, however, does not mean to say, that the pardon of sin takes away from him, who obtains it, the consciousness that he has once been the subject of moral turpitude. This the blood of Christ itself does not effect; and in heaven, the consciousness of this will forever raise high the notes of gratitude for redeeming mercy. But pardon may and does remove the apprehension of penalty for sin; or if by ἁμαρτιῶν we understand *sin, guilt* simply, then, *to be made clean* (κεκαθαρμένους) from this, so as to have no consciousness of it, is so to be purified, as not to contract the stain of it.

3. Ἀλλ' ἐν αὐταῖς ἐνιαυτόν, *nay rather, by these* [sacrifices] *yearly remembrance of sins is made.* Ἀλλά, *but rather, nay rather, quin, quinimo;* or, (as I have rendered it in the version), *on the contrary, but.* Αὐταῖς agrees with θυσίαις implied; see in

v. 1. On the day of annual atonement, the sacrifices that were offered being of an expiatory nature, and being designed as propitiatory offerings, they were of course adapted to remind the Hebrews of the desert of sin, i. e. of the punishment or penalty due to it. As they continued to be offered *yearly*, so those who brought them must be reminded, through their whole lives, of new desert of punishment. The writer means, however, that a yearly remembrance of sin in a *spiritual* respect, not merely in a civil or ecclesiastical one, was made; for in this sense, the yearly atonement procured pardon. In the other, it did not; as he now proceeds to assert.

4. *Ἀδύνατον γὰρ . . . ἁμαρτίας, it is, indeed, impossible that the blood of bulls and goats should remove the penalty due to sin.* *Ἀφαιρεῖν ἁμαρτίας* means, *to take away sin*, in the sense of *removing the penalty* or *consequences of sin*; for this is the subject of which the writer is now treating. That the author has reference to the consequences of sin in a future world, or to the punishment of it which God inflicts as the spiritual judge of men, is evident from the whole tenor of his discussion. One so profoundly versed as he was in all the Jewish ritual law, surely was not ignorant of the fact, that civil and ecclesiastical pardon for offences of various kinds, was every day procured by the blood of bulls and goats, and this too, agreeably to divine appointment.

5. Nothing could be more directly in opposition to Jewish prejudices, respecting the importance and value of the Levitical sacrifices, than the assertion just made. Hence the writer deems it prudent to make his appeal to the Scriptures, for confirmation of what he had advanced. This he does, by quoting a passage from Ps. xl., which he applies to the Messiah, and to the efficacy of the sin-offering made by him.

Διὸ εἰσερχόμενος εἰς τὸν κόσμον, λέγει, wherefore, entering into the world, he [Christ] *says*; i. e. because the blood of goats and bullocks is *not* efficacious, in procuring pardon for sin, Christ, when entering into the world, is represented by the Psalmist as saying, viz. in Ps. 40: 7 seq.

Θυσίαν καὶ προσφορὰν οὐκ ἐθέλησας, in sacrifice and oblation thou hast no pleasure. *Θυσία* means, *a sacrifice of some slain beast*, from *θύω, to kill.* So the corresponding Hebrew זֶבַח, from זָבַח, *mactare.* *Προσφορά* is *any thing offered* or *presented*; and here

it means, other oblations than those of sacrifices, such as thank-offerings, libations, etc. The corresponding Hebrew מִנְחָה, *gift, present*, comes from the obsolete root מָנַח, *to present*, Arabic مَنَحَ, the same. *Οὐκ ἐθέλησας*, Hebrew לֹא חָפַצְתָּ, is capable of being translated, *thou hast not required*, or, *thou hast not desired, thou hast no pleasure in* or *desire for*. The latter is, doubtless, the shade of meaning here. The sentiment is not, that God had not at all required sacrifices and oblations, for this he had done; but that they were, in a *comparative* sense, of little value; they were insufficient in themselves to accomplish the higher purposes of his spiritual law, and therefore he had no pleasure in them.

Σῶμα δὲ κατηρτίσω μοι, but a body hast thou prepared for me. A very difficult and much agitated expression. If we recur, in the first place, to the original Hebrew, we find the corresponding words there to be, אָזְנַיִם כָּרִיתָ־לִי, *mine ears hast thou opened.* The verb כָּרִיתָ (from כָּרָה) means, primarily, *to dig, to hollow out*, e. g. a well, Gen. 26: 25; a pit, Ps. 7: 16, or pit-fall, Ps. 57: 7; a sepulchre or grave, Gen. 50: 5. 2 Chron. 16: 14. The verb כָּרָה has also the meaning of *purchasing* or *procuring*, e. g. water, Deut. 2: 6; particularly of procuring a supply of food and drink, 2 K. 6: 23; also of other things, e. g. a wife, Hosea 3: 2, where אֶכְרָהָ has a Daghesh euphonic in the כ. These are all the meanings of this word, which the Hebrew Scriptures present. In translating אָזְנַיִם כָּרִיתָ לִי, then, we may render it either, *mine ears hast thou opened*, which is only a small deflection from the literal sense, (for *to dig* out a pit or well, is *to open* one); or we may render it, *ears hast thou provided for me*, in which sense the Seventy seem plainly to have understood כָּרִיתָ, when they rendered it by *κατηρτίσω*. The former sense seems to be more analogical with the nature of the subject, and with the Hebrew idiom. The Hebrews speak of *opening the ears*, and *uncovering them*, in order to designate the idea of *prompt obedience*, of attentive listening to the commands of any one. E. g. Is. 50: 4, we have יָעִיר לַי אֹזֶן לִשְׁמוֹעַ, *he excited my ear to hear;* and in v. 5 is an equivalent expression, פָּתַח לַי אֹזֶן, *he opened mine ear*, which is explained in the corresponding parallelism, by וְאָנֹכִי לֹא מָרִיתִי, *and I was not refractory*, i. e. I was obedient. So גָּלָה אֹזֶן *to uncover, to disclose the ear*, means, *to communicate any thing* or *reveal it to another;* e. g. 1 Sam. 20:

2, 12, 13. 22: 17. From such forms of expression, in Hebrew, with such a meaning, we may very naturally conclude that אָזְנַיִם כָּרִיתָ (in Ps. 40: 7) means, *thou hast opened mine ears*, i. e. thou hast made me obedient, or, I am entirely devoted to thy service. And Ps. 40: 8, 9, which exhibits the consequence of having the ears opened, leads us almost unavoidably to make such a conclusion, respecting the meaning of the phrase in question.

If this view of the meaning be correct, then another interpretation, put upon the phrase by many critics, is not well founded. They render it, *mine ears hast thou bored through*. They suppose the expression to be figurative, and to be borrowed from the Hebrew usage of boring through, with an awl, the ear of a person, who became the voluntary servant of another; as described in Ex. 21: 6. Deut. 15: 17. *Mine ears hast thou bored through* would then mean, 'I am through life thy voluntary servant,' or, 'I will be perpetually obedient to thee.' This sense, it will be seen, agrees in general with that put upon the phrase by the other mode of explanation. But the source of explanation here adopted, does not seem to be admissible. In Ex. 21: 6, the verb *bore through* is רָצַע, (not כָּרָה, as in Ps. 40: 7), and the instrument by which it is done is named מַרְצֵעַ, *an awl*, a derivate of the verb רָצַע. So in Deut. 15: 17, the instrument named is the same מַרְצֵעַ, and the action of *boring through* is expressed by נָתַתָּה בְאָזְנוֹ, *thou shalt put it through his ear*, (not כָּרִיתָ). That רָצַע and כָּרָה indicate very distinct actions, is sufficiently plain; for *to bore through* any thing, and *to dig* or *hollow out* a pit, grave, or well, are surely very different actions, indicated in Hebrew by verbs, as different as the English *dig* and *bore through*. Moreover, in Ex. 21: 6 and Deut. 15: 17, the singular אֹזֶן is used, and not as here אָזְנַיִם, *both ears*.

The original, then, in Ps. 40: 2, אָזְנַיִם כָּרִיתָ לִי, means, *mine ears has thou opened*, i. e. me hast thou made readily or attentively obedient; at least, this seems to be the meaning, if we make Is. 50: 4, 5 our exegetical guide. See Excursus XX.

6. Ὁλοκαυτώματα καὶ εὐδόκησας, *in whole burnt offerings and* [sacrifices] *for sin thou hast no delight*. Ὁλοκαυτώματα means, *such offerings as were entirely consumed upon the altar*; so the corresponding Heb. עוֹלָה signifies. Περὶ ἁμαρτίας is an elliptical expression, answering to the Hebrew original חַטָּאת, and which completed would be, θυσίαι περὶ ἁμαρτίας, *sin-offerings*. Οὐκ εὐδόκη-

σας, Heb. לֹא שָׁאַלְתָּ, *requirest not, desirest not, demandest not, hast no pleasure in.*

7. *Τότε εἶπον, therefore I said,* or, *then I said.* The first of these versions is approved by eminent critics. They suggest, that if τότε (Heb. אָז) be referred to *time* merely, it seems very difficult to ascertain what is the precise meaning; for at what particular *time* was it, that God did not delight in whole burnt offerings and sacrifices for sin? It may however be said, that the speaker here refers to the time, when he is disclosing these views respecting sacrifices. Supposing this to be the case, τότε would mean, *then*, i. e. immediately after this sentiment was declared; which would be very congruous with the context. If τότε be rendered, *therefore*, the meaning will be, 'because thou hadst no pleasure in sacrifices, *therefore* I said, etc.' Strictly speaking, however, τότε is not *illative*. I prefer the other rendering.

Ἰδοὺ ἥκω θέλημά σου, Lo! I come, O God, to do thy will, (in the volume of the book it is written respecting me). Ἰδοὺ ἥκω expresses the *readiness* of him who speaks, to obey the will of God.

Ἐν κεφαλίδι βιβλίου is a much agitated expression. The Hebrew is simply בִּמְגִלַּת־סֵפֶר, *in the roll*, or *volume of the book*. But how does κεφαλίδι βιβλίου correspond to this? Κεφαλίς denotes *the end* or *extremity* of any thing, as being *the head* or *summit* of it. The Heb. סֵפֶר, *βιβλίον*, was a manuscript rolled upon a cylinder of light wood, at the extremity of which were *heads* or *knobs*, for the sake of convenience to those who used the manuscript. The *knob* or *head*, κεφαλίς, is here taken as a *part*, which is descriptive or emblematic of the *whole*. Κεφαλὶς βιβλίου means therefore, a βιβλίον or סֵפֶר with a κεφαλίς, i. e. a manuscript roll; which was the form of the Jewish sacred books, and is still retained in all their synagogues. It coincides, then, with regard to signification, very exactly with the Heb. מְגִלַּת סֵפֶר, of which it is a translation.

But what volume of manuscript-roll is here meant? Plainly the one which was already extant, when the Psalmist was writing. If the Psalmist was David himself, (as the title of the psalm seems to affirm), the only parts of the Hebrew Scriptures then extant, and of course the only part to which he could refer, must have been the Pentateuch, and perhaps the book of Joshua. Beyond any reasonable doubt, then, the κεφαλὶς βιβλίου (מְגִלַּת סֵפֶר) was the Pentateuch.

But *what* is there written, and *how*, respecting the personage who speaks in the 40th Psalm? Rosenmüller (on Ps. 40: 7) translates the Hebrew בָּתוּב עָלַי (*γέγραπται περὶ ἐμοῦ*) by *prescriptum est miki*, and appeals to 2 K. 22: 13, for confirmation of this version. He compares, also, Gen. 2: 16. Ezra 1: 2, where עַל is used after צִוָּה and פָּקַד, verbs of *commanding* or *enjoining*. Gesenius approves this version, but produces no other instances to confirm it, which are of the same kind. He appeals, indeed, to Est. 9: 23, where אֶל is used after כָּתַב; and to Hos. 8: 12. 2 K. 17: 37, and Prov. 22: 20, where לְ is used after the same verb, in order to confirm this interpretation. But the three last cases plainly denote nothing more, than that the matter referred to was *written for the use of another*, or *addressed to him*. Such too is the case with the other example in Est. 9: 23; as may be clearly seen by comparing Est. 9: 20. With deference to the opinion of these very distinguished critics, I must still doubt, therefore, whether כָּתַב עַל means, *praescribere alicui*. At most, there is only 2 K. 22: 13, which is apposite to establish this signification; and even here the meaning in question is not *necessary*; for וַהֲכָתוּב עָלֵינוּ may be rendered, with about equal significancy, *which was written in respect to us*, or *concerning us*, i. e. for our sake, or to regulate our duties. The Seventy, then, who translated בָּתוּב עָלַי by *γέγραπται περὶ ἐμοῦ*, translated it agreeably to the usual idiom of the Hebrew. The apostle, in our text, has evidently recognized the correctness of this version. The difference in meaning, between *prescribed to me* and *written concerning me*, is a considerable one, in this case. The first version would represent the speaker as saying, "I come, O God, to do thy will, [i. e. my duty], as I am commanded in the Scriptures to do." The second, "I come to offer my body, or myself, in place of the legal sacrifices; for in the Scriptures, [i. e. in the law of Moses], this is written concerning me." Now as to a choice of versions here, it will not be doubted, that the latter version accords with the reasoning and design of the apostle, or rather, that it is important to his purpose. The first version would not, indeed, contradict the design of the apostle; for he might say, It is prescribed in the Scriptures, that the Messiah should do the will of God, i. e. make himself an offering for sin. Comp. Luke 24: 25—27, 46. Acts 17: 2, 3. 1 Pet. 1: 11, 12. But I apprehend the meaning of the writer to be, that the *book of the law*, which prescribes sacrifices

that were merely *σκιαὶ* or *παραβολαὶ* of the great atoning sacrifice by Christ, did itself teach, by the use of these, that something of a higher and better nature was to be looked for than Levitical rites. In a word, it pointed to the Messiah, or, some of the contents of the *written* law had respect to him. So Michaelis, Storr, and others. Still, *γέγραπται περὶ ἐμοῦ* may have respect to declarations, in the Pentateuch, of a different and more direct nature. That there are such, Jesus himself affirms, John 5: 46. So Paul, Acts 26: 22, 23. Gal. 3: 16 seq. Construed in either way, the amount of the phrase under consideration is, 'In the law of Moses I am described as coming to do thy will,' i. e. to offer my body as a sacrifice, comp. v. 10.

That the Hebrews, to whom the apostle addressed himself, would recognize such an affirmation, and feel the force of it, seems to be nearly certain, from the fact, that the writer without any hesitation addresses it to them, in order to produce conviction in their minds with respect to the point which he is labouring to establish. Certain it is, then, that both he and the Christian Hebrews to whom he wrote, believed that the Jewish ritual had respect to the sacrifice of the Messiah, and that he was virtually revealed, in the law of Moses, as a suffering Saviour, making atonement for the sins of his people. Were this not so, then the argument in Heb. 10: 5—10 would be destitute of any real foundation, and consequently, of any force as a proof of what the writer is labouring to establish.

Ὁ θεός, Heb. אֱלֹהַי, *O my God.* If the Messiah be considered as uttering this before his incarnation, and as *Logos*, then would it be an embarrassing circumstance to explain it, how in his simple *divine* nature he could speak of "*my* God." But if considered as a prophetic anticipation of what he would say, during his incarnation, (and so it clearly seems to me the writer intends it should be considered), then *ὁ θεός*, or *ὁ θεός μου*, accords with the usage of the Saviour in addressing the Father, as disclosed in the gospel, Matt. 27: 46, al.

Τὸ θέλημά σου. What this will is, see in v. 10.

8. *Ἀνώτερον λέγων εὐδόκησας, first, he says, "Sacrifice, and oblation, and whole burnt-offering, and* [offering] *for sin thou desirest not, nor hast pleasure in them."* *Ἀνώτερον*, lit. *above*, which is equivalent here to *first*, or, *in the first place.*

Αἵτινες κατὰ τὸν νόμον προσφέρονται, which are presented ac-

cording to the law. This is a parenthetic explanation, added by the writer, in order to shew that the same legal sacrifices, in which the Hebrews were in danger of placing their confidence, were those which must be superseded by the death of Christ.

9. *Τότε εἴρηκεν τὸ θέλημά σου, and then says,* "*Lo I come to do thy will.*" We might expect *εἶπων* here, instead of *εἴρηκεν*, for the *regular* construction of the sentence would seem to require it. But here is a sentence constructed in the Hebrew manner, which not unfrequently begins with a participle in the first clause, and then uses a verb in the second, when both stand in the same relation to the sequel of the sentence, see Heb. Gram. § 212. 2. It is evident here, that *ἀνώτερον λέγων* and *τότε εἴρηκε* both bear the same relation to *ἀναιρεῖ κ. τ. λ.* the sense of which, I may add, is rendered quite obscure, by the period which most editors of the Greek Testament have put before it.

Ἀναιρεῖ στήσῃ, he abolishes the first, viz. the sacrifices etc. *that he may establish the second,* viz. the doing of the will of God, or the offering of himself as a sacrifice for sin, v. 10. That is, 'doing the will of God, or obedience to him even unto death, or the offering up of his body, is represented by the Psalmist as a substitute for legal sacrifices, and as an arrangement which would supersede them.'

It is quite plain, that *ἀναιρεῖ κ. τ. λ.* is an inference, drawn from the two declarations recited in the context immediately preceding; for *πρῶτον* certainly refers to the legal sacrifices, and *δεύτερον* to the obedience of the Messiah. But the construction of the sentence, (for clearly it is in fact but one sentence), is Hebraistic, as noted above, and not according to the rules of classical Greek; and it affords a notable example, how far the style of our author is from the easy, rhetorical, flowing method, of which so much has been said by late critics, and from that *ἑλληνικότης*, which even Origen ascribes to him.

10. The writer proceeds to explain what is meant, in this case, by *doing the will of God*, and what is the efficacy of that obedience. *Ἐν ᾧ θελήματι ἐφάπαξ, by which will expiation is made for us, by the offering of the body of Jesus Christ, once for all.* *Ἐν ᾧ θελήματι* means, *by doing which will,* i. e. by whose obedience. *Ἡγιασμένοι ἐσμέν, expiati sumus, conciliati sumus, purifi-*

cati sumus, lit. *we are consecrated*, viz. to God, which necessarily implies, *purified, atoned for*; see on ἁγιάζω under 2: 11.

The latter part of the verse leaves no doubt, that the writer meant to refer the *obedience* in question, or *the doing of the will of God*, to "obedience unto death," to the voluntary sacrifice for sinners which the Saviour offered upon the cross; comp. Phil. 2: 8.

The whole amount of the reasoning, in vs. 5—10, is this. 'Ritual sacrifices for sin are not accepted by God, as sufficient to remove the penalty due to the moral turpitude of sin. But the obedience of the Messiah unto death, the offering of his body on the cross, is sufficient, and fully supersedes the other sacrifices.'

If all this be true, it follows, of course, that what the apostle had affirmed in v. 3 is true, viz. that it is impossible for the blood of slain beasts to remove the penal consequences of sin, when considered in the light of a *spiritual* offence, and as having respect to the tribunal of God.

Ἐφάπαξ, *once for all*. The idea conveyed by this, is carefully repeated again here, because it concerns a point, in respect to which the Hebrews would be very prone to raise objections. "You affirm," they would naturally say, "that there is a resemblance between the sacrifice of Christ and the annual expiatory sacrifices by the high priest. But there is evidently a great dissimilitude; for the expiation made by the high priest was repeated *every year*; while Christ suffered *only once*." The apostle meets this difficulty, by shewing, from various considerations, that being *once* slain as an expiatory offering, was altogether sufficient to satisfy the demands of the case. Compare Heb. 9: 9—14, 25—28. 10: 1—3, 10—14. Indeed Christ, from the nature of the case, could die but once, 9: 27, 28.

11. Καὶ πᾶς μὲν ἱερεὺς θυσίας, *now every priest stands performing daily service, and oftentimes presenting the same sacrifices*. Πᾶς ἱερεύς, every or any Levitical priest. Ἕστηκε, *stands*, denoting the attitude of those who are in waiting or attendance upon another, and keep the position of *standing*, both as a token of respect, and as a state prepared for ready service. It is only the perfect, pluperfect, aor. 2 active, and aor. 1 passive, of the verb ἵστημι, that have the intransitive meaning *to stand*. The other tenses are transitive, and mean, *to set, place, station*, etc. See Buttmann § 95, and Wahl's Lex. on the word; and compare (for a sense of the word like that above) Rev. 7: 9, 11. 8: 2.

Τὰς αὐτὰς θυσίας. The same daily sacrifices were repeated, without intermission; see Num. 28: 2—6.

Αἵτινες οὐδέποτε ἁμαρτίας, which can never remove the penalty due to sin; comp. vs. 1—3. That *ἁμαρτίας* here means, *penalty due to sin*, is plain; and that it may be properly so construed, no one will deny, who understands the full meaning of חַטָּאת and חֲטָאָה.

12. *Οὗτος δὲ μίαν θεοῦ, but this* [priest] *having offered a sacrifice for sin of perpetual efficacy, sat down at the right hand of God.* In v. 11, we have *πᾶς ἱερεύς*, i. e. every priest of the common order, every Levitical priest; the antithesis is *οὗτος*, which refers to Christ, and which, (if the ellipsis be supplied according to the grammatical construction of sentences), must mean, *οὗτος ἱερεύς*.

Εἰς τὸ διηνεκές means the same thing here, as *ἅπαξ* in 9: 26, 28, and *ἐφάπαξ* in 10: 10. I connect it with *θυσίαν*, and not (as Carpzoff) with *ἐκάθισε*. *A sacrifice for perpetuity*, is a sacrifice *once for all, ἐφάπαξ*, or, it is a sacrifice of perpetual efficacy, one that needs not to be repeated.

Ἐκάθισεν ἐν δεξιᾷ τοῦ θεοῦ, see on Heb. 1: 3. *Ἐκάθισε* here is opposed to *ἕστηκε* in the preceding verse. The latter denotes the attitude of a *servant*; the former that of a *master* or *lord*.

13. *Τὸ λοιπὸν ἐκδεχόμενος ποδῶν αὐτοῦ, thenceforth waiting until his enemies be made his footstool. Τὸ λοιπόν* means, *for the rest*, viz. of the time; therefore the idea conveyed by *λοιπόν* here is, *afterwards, thenceforth. Ἐκδεχόμενος* designates the attitude of *waiting* or *expecting*. The idea is, that the Messiah is seated on his throne, quietly expecting that his enemies will, in due time, be all subdued.

Οἱ ἐχθροί designates all those who are opposed to the character, doctrines, or reign of Christ. *To make them his footstool* means, thoroughly to subjugate and humble them; comp. 2: 8. 1 Cor. 15: 27, 28. See the origin of this phrase, in the custom described in Josh. 10: 24.

14. *Μιᾷ γὰρ προσφορᾷ τοὺς ἁγιαζομένους, by one offering, then, he has forever perfected those for whom expiation is made. Μιᾷ προσφορᾷ*, viz. the offering of his own body, v. 10. *Τετελείωκε*, see on 9: 9 and 10: 1. The meaning is, 'He has forever removed the penalty due to sin, and procured for those, who were

exposed to it, that peace of conscience which the law could never give; comp. vs. 1—4. *Ἁγιαζομένους*, see on 2: 11. 9: 13. 10: 10.

15. *Μαρτυρεῖ δὲ ἡμῖν ἅγιον, moreover, the Holy Spirit also testifies* [this] *to us. Δέ, moreover*, a continuative of the discourse, here marking the transition to a new paragraph, in which appeal is made, by way of confirming what the writer had said. *The Holy Spirit* means, the Holy Spirit who speaks by the Scriptures; as the sequel shews, which is a quotation from the Scriptures. *Ἡμῖν, to us*, means, that the sentiment which the writer had been inculcating, the truths which he had declared, are confirmed by what the Holy Spirit says *to us*, i. e. to us and to all, in the Scriptures of truth.

Μετὰ γὰρ τὸ προειρηκέναι, for after having first said, viz. first in order, or in respect to time.

16. *Αὕτη ἡ διαθήκη κ. τ. λ.* See on chap. 8: 10, where is the same quotation. It is worthy of note, however, that even here, where the same passage is appealed to, the *words* are not all the same. In 8: 10, we have *τῷ οἴκῳ Ἰσραήλ*; in 10: 16, *αὐτούς*: in the former, *διδοὺς νόμους μου εἰς τὴν διάνοιαν αὐτῶν*; in the latter, *διδοὺς νόμους μου ἐπὶ καρδίας αὐτῶν*: in the former, *ἐπὶ καρδίας αὐτῶν ἐπιγράψω αὐτούς*; in the latter, *ἐπὶ τῶν διανοιῶν αὐτῶν ἐπιγράψω αὐτούς. Non refert verbum, sed res ipsa.* The meaning of both is the same. *De minimis non curat lex.*

17. *Καὶ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν κ. τ. λ.* (see on 8: 12), *then* [he says] "*Their sins*, etc." *Καί, then*, here evidently marks the *apodosis* or corresponding and concluding part of the sentiment, and stands as a kind of counterpart to *πρό* in *μετὰ γὰρ τὸ προειρηκέναι*, v. 15; otherwise the sentence is an example of the *anacoluthon*. Comp. 8: 10—12, where the distance, at which *τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν κ. τ. λ.* follows the first clause, justifies the translation here given to *καί*; a translation which, indeed, is frequently necessary in the writings of the New Testament, in order to render the connexion of the sense plain.

18. The writer next proceeds to shew, for what purpose this quotation is here made, i. e. to express the sentiment, that under the new covenant or gospel dispensation, absolute and *final* pardon is to be obtained. *Ὅπου δὲ ἄφεσις ἁμαρτίας, now where there is remission of these, there is no more offering for sin.*

Ἄφεσις here means, *spiritual pardon* or *remission*, on the part of God as judge and ruler of the world. Τούτων, i. e. τούτων ἁμαρτιῶν καὶ ἀνομιῶν mentioned in the preceding verse. Οὐκέτι, i. e. offering is no more needed, is no more presented.

This circumstance makes a great difference between the new covenant and the old one. Under the latter, sacrifices must be perpetually repeated; and after all, only *civil* and *ecclesiastical* pardon was to be obtained by them. Under the former, one sacrifice is sufficient, and avails to procure, for all nations and all ages, spiritual pardon or remission of the penalty threatened to be inflicted in a future world. Well might the apostle call this *a new covenant*.

The writer having gone through a comparison of the new dispensation with the old, and having shewn, that whether Christ be compared with angels who were the mediators of the Mosaic law, or with Moses himself, or with the high priest of the Hebrews, he holds a rank far above them; having also shewn, that whether the temple in which he ministers be compared with that at Jerusalem, or the sacrifice which he offers be compared with those sacrifices presented by the Jewish priests, either as to its exalted nature, its spiritual efficacy in respect to procuring pardon for sin, or the duration and extent of its effects, the Mosaic institutions are nothing more than the *shadow*, of which the Christian ones are the *substance*; he now proceeds to the hortatory and admonitory part of his epistle. In this, various subjects are presented, which the circumstances of those whom he was addressing rendered it expedient to consider. All that was peculiarly attractive to the Jew, in the Mosaic ritual; all that served to allure him away from his adherence to Christianity and expose him particularly to the danger of apostasy, the the apostle has brought into view, in the preceding part of our epistle, with a design to shew, that however attractive or important these things might in themselves be, there was something still more so in the Christian religion, something of which the Jewish religion offered only a shadow or adumbration. Nothing could be more apposite, then, to the case in hand, than the argument of the apostle, in the preceding part of this epistle.

The practical application, which follows, is designed to excite those whom the writer addresses, to constancy and perseverance in their Christian profession, to dehort them from apostasy, and to warn them against its tremendous consequences. With his warnings, however, the apostle intermingles a great deal of encouragement and promise, in order to excite in them an earnest desire to obtain the rewards, which would be bestowed on all who remained faithful to the end of their course.

He begins the hortatory part, by an appeal to the great encouragement, which the present privileges of the Hebrew Christians afforded them, to persevere in their Christian profession.

10. Ἔχοντες οὖν, ἀδελφοὶ Ἰησοῦ, *since, then, brethren, ye have free access to the sanctuary, by the blood of Jesus.* Οὖν, *then,*

therefore, or, *since then*. *Παρρησία*, in its first acceptation, means *boldness of speech*, or, *the liberty of speaking without restraint*. But the word is also used to designate, *freedom from restraint* generally considered; which is plainly the case here. *Παρρησίαν εἰς τὴν εἴσοδον*, lit. *freedom in respect to entrance*, i. e. free access, unrestrained liberty of approach. *Ἁγίων*, i. e. *ἀληθινῶν*, the heavenly sanctuary, or, the presence of God, comp. 9: 24. *Ἐν τῷ αἵματι Ἰησοῦ* denotes, the means by which this access is procured, agreeably to what has been shown in chap. VII—X.

20. *Ἣν ἐνεκαίνισεν ζῶσαν, in a new and living way which he has consecrated.* *Ὁδόν* I take to be the accusative of *manner*, construed with *κατά* understood; or it may be considered as a repetition of *εἴσοδον*, and in apposition with it. *Πρόσφατον* means, *recent*, and has reference to the way *lately* opened by the new covenant or gospel dispensation. The *way* is called *new*, however, not merely because of this, but also because those who draw nigh to God in it, have liberty of access in their own persons to the mercy seat, and there obtain pardon, by means of a sacrifice altogether different from that which was offered for worshippers by the Jewish priests.

Ζῶσαν, i. q. *ζωοποιοῦσαν*, i. e. *εἰς ζωὴν ἄγουσαν, leading to life, conferring life* or *happiness*. So *ζάω* is often used in the New Testament. But it may mean, here, *perennial, perpetual*, (a frequent sense of *ζάω* in the Hebrew Greek); and this would be altogether congruous with the preceding context, which insists on the *perpetuity* of the sacrifice of Christ. On the whole I prefer the former sense. So Theophylact, who assigns the following reason for the epithet *ζῶσαν*, viz. *ὅτι ἡ πρώτη ὁδὸς θανατηφόρος ἦν*, i. e. because that any one, who entered the inner vail of the temple, was punished with *death*. But here, viz. under the gospel, it is the way to *life*.

Ἐνεκαίνισε, consecrated, dedicated. To consecrate a way, is to open it for access, to dedicate it to use. So Jesus opened the way of access for sinners to the eternal sanctuary, in which, if they go, they may obtain free access to God, and pardon for all their offences.

Διὰ τοῦ καταπετάσματος σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ, through the vail, that is, his flesh. I translate these words literally, because I am not well satisfied that I understand their meaning. The opinions

of all the commentators it would be tedious, if not useless, to recite. The principal interpretation, in which the most distinguished of them unite, is, that, as the vail of the temple must be *removed* in order to enter the inner sanctuary, so the body of Jesus must be removed (by death), that we might have liberty of access to the sanctuary above. An exegesis which, while the facts to which it alludes are true, still presents a comparison incongruous at first view, and seemingly requires a distorted imagination to recognise it with any degree of satisfaction.

I could more easily acquiesce in the idea, that there is a kind of *paronomasia* here, in respect to the word διά. The form of it may be thus expressed. 'As the most holy place in the earthly temple, could be approached only *through* (διά) the vail, i. e. through the aperture which the vail covered; so the heavenly sanctuary is approached only *through* (διά implied) *the flesh* or *body of Jesus*.' In this last case, διά (if employed as here supposed) would mean, *by means of, because of, on account of*, viz. by means of the body of Jesus sacrificed for sin, see v. 10. The paronomasia would consist in using διά, in the first case, in the sense of *through* with respect to *place*; and in the last case, in the sense of *through*, with the signification of *by means of*. Instances could easily be accumulated, where the same word is employed in different senses, in the same sentence. E. g. 'Let the *dead* (νεκρούς) bury their *dead* (νεκρούς),' Luke 9: 60; where νεκρούς, in the first case, means *morally dead*, in the second, *physically dead*. So 2 Cor. 5: 21, 'He hath made him to be *a sin offering* (ἁμαρτίαν), who knew no *sin* (ἁμαρτίαν).' In like manner the apostle might say, 'As the Jews had access to the inner sanctuary of the temple, διὰ καταπετάσματος, *through the vail*, so Christians have access to the heavenly sanctuary, διὰ σαρκός, i. e. διὰ προσφορᾶς σαρκὸς Ἰησοῦ,' comp. v. 10. And although I would not admit paronomasia, except in cases where there are urgent reasons for it, it seems to be more tolerable here, than the other method of interpretation suggested above, and is certainly in harmony with the *principles* of the *usus loquendi* of the sacred writers.

But after all, the mind still seems to feel a want of definite satisfaction, in regard to either of the methods of interpretation above proposed. May I be allowed, in a difficulty of such a nature, to

propose, at least for consideration, a third method of interpreting the expression *τῆς σαρκός αὐτοῦ*?

In John 1: 14, it is said, 'The Word became flesh, *σάρξ*; to which the writer adds, *καὶ ἐσκήνωσεν ἐν ἡμῖν*. In 1 Tim. 3: 16, we have *θεὸς ἐφανερώθη ἐν σαρκί*, supposing the reading to be correct, (and the evidence seems to me quite in its favour, and so Dr. Knapp has judged). In Rom. 1: 4, a broad distinction is made between the nature of Christ *κατὰ σαρκά* and his nature *κατὰ πνεῦμα ἁγιωσύνης*; and in Rom. 9: 5, Christ is said to have descended from the Jewish fathers *κατὰ σαρκά*, while he is at the same time, *ὁ ἐπὶ πάντων θεός*. In Phil. 2: 6, Christ, who was *ἐν μορφῇ θεοῦ*, ——*ἐκένωσεν ἑαυτόν, μορφὴν δούλου λαβών*. In all these, and in many more passages which might easily be added, the human nature or body of Christ, seems to be regarded as a kind of temporary tabernacle, or *vail* of the divine nature which dwelt in him. May not our author, in the verse under consideration, have had such an idea in his mind, when he wrote *τοῦ καταπετάσματος, τοῦτ' ἔστι, τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ*? The idea would seem to be this; 'As the vail of the temple concealed the glory of Jehovah, in the holy of holies, from the view of men, so Christ's flesh or body screened or concealed the higher nature from our view, (which dwelt within this vail, as God did of old within the vail of the temple).' If, on this account, the apostle calls Christ's flesh *a vail*, then we may easily make out the sense of the verse before us. It would stand thus; 'As God dwells behind the vail, in his earthly temple; so God dwells behind the vail of Jesus' body, in his spiritual temple, i. e. he can be approached only through the medium of this, or by means of this.' So the context which precedes; 'free access to the sanctuary is *ἐν αἵματι Ἰησοῦ*.' That the writer had in his mind, a design to compare the vail of the Jewish temple, as the medium between the worshipper and the visible presence of Jehovah, to the body of Christ (*σὰρξ αὐτοῦ*) as the medium of access to God, or what must interpose between God and him; and this specially in reference to Christ's sufferings and death; seems to be, on the whole, quite clear. But which of the ways now proposed, will best present this general idea, or whether any of them are sufficiently grounded, to be fully admitted, is a question on which the reader must be left to judge for himself. My own apprehension, on the whole, is, that the occasion of calling Christ's flesh a *vail*, or of comparing it to a

vail, lies in the views stated under this last explanation; while, at the same time, the actual comparison of the vail of the temple and of Christ's body, is confined to the single point, that *each is a medium of access to God*. If you say, 'The comparison is, in most respects, without grounds of analogy, and the two things widely dissimilar;' my answer is, that there is as much congruity in it, as there is in the comparison between the *physical* death of Christ, in Rom. VI., and the *moral* death of believers to sin, to which the former is there compared. Indeed, between all objects of comparison, when God or Christ is one of these objects, there must of course be a dissimilarity that is exceedingly great in some respects, although there may be an analogy in some others.

In whatever light our passage is viewed, it will be conceded, that its language is far from being in that *easy flowing* style, which has been so often asserted of our epistle.

21. *Καὶ ἱερέα θεοῦ*, i. e. *καὶ ἔχοντες ἱερέα κ. τ. λ.* the part. being *implied*, which was expressed at the beginning of v. 19. Comp. 4: 14. 5: 10. 7: 17, 20, 26. 8: 1. *Ἱερέα μέγαν* is the same as גָּדוֹל כֹּהֵן, *high priest*, a Hebraism. *Ἐπὶ τὸν οἶκον τοῦ θεοῦ*, comp. 3: 1—6. It designates here the *spiritual house* of God, i. e. Christians.

22. *Προσερχώμεθα, let us draw nigh*, i. e. *τῷ θεῷ*, which is implied. The manner of the expression is borrowed from approach to the most holy place in the temple, where God peculiarly dwelt.

Μετὰ ἀληθινῆς πίστεως, with a true heart, in full confidence. *Ἀληθινῆς* means, *sincere, faithful, true*, and designates sincerity of Christian profession, faithful attachment to Christianity, in opposition to an insincere or an apostatising state of mind. *Πληροφορία* means, a *full measure*. *Πληροφορία πίστεως* means, *unwavering, undoubting faith*, a *fulness of faith* which leaves no room for *apostasy* or skepticism. How exactly this exhortation was adapted to the state of the Hebrews, it is easy to perceive.

Ἐῤῥαντισμένοι πονηρᾶς, being purified as to our hearts from a consciousness of evil, lit. *being sprinkled as to our hearts*, etc. The expression is borrowed from the rites of the law, agreeably to which, very many ceremonial purifications, as we have seen, were made by the sprinkling of blood either upon persons or utensils. This was *external*. But when the writer says here, *ἐῤῥαντισμένοι τὰς καρδίας*, he designates *spiritual, internal* purification, and shews

that he is not speaking of any *external* rites. This *internal purification* is effected by the blood of Jesus, with which Christians are figuratively said to be sprinkled. But the construction, ἐῤῥαντισμένοι.... ἀπὸ.... shews that the participle ἐῤῥαντισμένοι is to be taken in the secondary or metaphorical sense, i. e. *purified from, cleansed from.*

Συνειδήσεως πονηρᾶς, a consciousness of evil, or, *a conscience oppressed with evil* or *sin.* Perhaps both senses are included; for both are characteristic of Christian sincerity and full faith, which is incompatible with a consciousness of evil designs, and which frees men from an oppressive sense of past evil, by inspiring them with the hope of pardon.

23. *Καὶ λελουμένοι.... καθαρῷ, having also our bodies washed with pure water;* another expression, borrowed from the frequent washings prescribed by the Levitical law, for the sake of external purification. See Ex. 29: 4. 40: 31, 32. Lev. 16: 4. also chap. VI. XIV. XV. et alibi. It seems to me, that here is a plain allusion to the use of water in the initiatory rite of Christian baptism. This is altogether consonant with the method of our author, who is every where comparing Christian institutions with Jewish ones. So, in the case before us, he says, 'The Jews were sprinkled with blood in order that they might be purified so as to have access to God; Christians are internally sprinkled, i. e. purified by the blood of Jesus. The Jews were washed with water, in order to be ceremonially purified so as to come before God; Christians have been washed by the purifying water of baptism.' So Ananias exhorts Saul to be baptized and *wash away his sins*, Acts 22: 16. In this latter case, and in that before us, the phrase is borrowed from the legal rite of washing for purification. In Heb. 10: 23, no particular stress is to be laid on the mere external rite of *washing the body;* for the connexion shews, that the whole is designed to point out the *spiritual* qualifications of sincere Christians for access to God. But the manner of expression turns wholly upon a comparison with the Jewish rites.

Κατέχωμεν τὴν ὁμολογίαν.... ἐπαγγειλάμενος, let us hold fast the hope which we profess; for faithful is he who has promised. 'Ομολογίαν means, *profession* or *confession of the Christian religion*, which is here called ἐλπίδος, in reference to the hopes which it occasions or inspires. The idea is, 'Let us firmly retain our profession of that religion, which fills us with hope respecting future rewards and happiness.'

Πιστὸς γὰρ ὁ ἐπαγγειλάμενος, i. e. let us firmly adhere to our religion, because God, the author of those promises which it holds forth, will certainly perform them; he is *faithful*, i. e. true to his word, and altogether worthy of confidence in respect to his promises.

24. *Καὶ κατανοῶμεν ἔργων, let us also bear in mind one another, so as to excite to love and good works. Κατανοῶμεν, consider attentively, have a regard to, think upon* or *bear in mind.* The writer means, that it is the duty of the Hebrews to cherish a mutual spirit of interest or concern for each other; and this, in such a way as would be the means of mutually exciting each other to more distinguished benevolence and good works. The perils to which they were exposed, rendered such advice very timely.

25. *Μὴ ἐγκαταλείποντες παρακαλοῦντες, not forsaking the assembling of ourselves together, (as the custom of some is), but admonishing* [one another]. *Ἐγκαταλείποντες* is in the same construction with *κατανοῶμεν* in v. 24, and consequently agrees with *ἡμεῖς* understood. *Ἑαυτῶν* relates to the first person plural here; as it does elsewhere, e. g. Rom. 8: 23. 1 Cor. 11: 31. 2 Cor. 1: 9. 10: 12, 14. In like manner, *παρακαλοῦντες* requires *ἀλλήλους* to be mentally supplied after it; which is expressed after *κατανοῶμεν*. That *παρακαλέω* means, *to admonish*, any common lexicon will shew. The whole sentence is in the usual manner of the writer, who very frequently employs *κοίνωσις* in warnings and admonitions.

Καὶ τοσούτῳ μᾶλλον ἡμέραν, and this [do] *so much the more, as ye see the day approaching.* That is, be more earnest and constant, in mutual admonition and efforts to excite each other to Christian diligence and perseverance, in proportion as the time draws near, when the judgments denounced against the Jewish nation, by the Saviour, will be executed. *Ἡμέραν, day*, is doubtless an elliptical expression for *ἡμέραν κυρίου*, יוֹם יְהוָה; a very common expression of the Hebrew writers, for a time of distress, of chastisement; a time in which God executes the threats which have been uttered by his prophets. Comp. Ps. 37: 13. 1 Sam. 26: 10. Ezek. 21: 25. 13: 5. Job 18: 20. 24: 1. Amos 5: 18. Jer. 30: 7. Joel 1: 15. Is. 2: 12. Rev. 16: 14, et alibi. Now as Christ had foretold the destruction of the Jewish temple and nation, (which could not be unknown to the Hebrew Christians), what could be

more natural than for the apostle to say, 'Brethren, do every thing in your power to guard against apostasy. And this the more, because a return to Judaism would now be very ill timed; the season is near, when the Jewish temple and state are to be destroyed.' All this is surely very apposite to the case in hand.

But if we should suppose, (with not a few of the recent commentators), that the writer here alludes to the day when Christ should reappear and commence a visible reign on earth, (which they suppose the apostles to have believed, in common with many individual Christians of early times), then I could not perceive so much force in the apostle's argument. It would run thus; 'Be very strenuous in using all means to guard against defection from Christianity to Judaism; and this so much the more, because, in a little time, Christ will commence his visible reign on earth.' I will not deny, that the hope of reward for perseverance in Christian virtue, to be bestowed under this new order of things, might be used as an argument to dissuade from apostasy; but plainly, the argument as above stated is more cogent, and more to the writer's purpose. How it can be proved to any one, after he has read and well considered Paul's second epistle to the Thessalonians, that this apostle believed in the *immediate* and *visible* advent of Christ, is more than I am able to see.

For these reasons, I hesitate not to apply the phrase, *ἡμέραν ἐγγίζουσαν*, to the time in which the Jewish state and temple were to be brought to an end.

26. *Ἑκουσίως γὰρ θυσία, moreover, should we voluntarily make defection from our religion, after receiving the knowledge of the truth, no more sacrifice for sin remaineth.* *Ἑκουσίως*, I apprehend, is not to be construed here with *metaphysical* exactness, but has reference to the common and acknowledged distinction in the Jewish law between the sins of oversight or inadvertence, (שְׁגָגָה), and those of presumption. For the first class, see Lev. 4: 2, 13, 22, 27. Num. 15: 27—29; for the second, Num. 15: 30, 31, where the presumptuous offender is described by the expression, אֲשֶׁר, רַעֲשֶׂה בְיָד רָמָה, *who acts with a high hand.* That this is the kind of offence to which the apostle alludes, is evident; for he distinguishes it expressly from the *sin of oversight* or inadvertence, (שְׁגָגָה), by saying, that it is committed after being enlightened by the gospel. *Ἑκουσίως* means then, *deliberately, with forethought,*

with settled intention, and not by merely sudden and violent impulse, or by oversight.

That *ἁμαρτανόντων*, in this case, refers to the sin of *apostasy*, is quite plain from the context and the nature of the case, as well as from the object which the writer has in view. *Ἀληθείας*, *true doctrine*, i. e. the gospel, Christian instruction.

Οὐκ ἔτι θυσία, i. e. if you make defection from Christianity, and renounce your hope and trust in the atoning sacrifice of Christ, no other is provided, or can be provided, for you. No other makes real atonement for sin; this being renounced, therefore, your case is desperate. The sacrifice under the new covenant is never, like the Jewish offerings, to be repeated. Apostasy from your present religion, then, is final perdition.

27. *Φοβερὰ δέ τις ὑπεναντίους*, *but a kind of fearful expectation of punishment, yea, of burning indignation* [awaits us], *which will consume the adversaries*. *Κρίσεως* often means, *condemnation*, and sometimes the consequences of it, i. e. *punishment*, as here. *Ζῆλος πυρός* is equivalent to the Hebrew קִנְאַת אֵשׁ, Zeph. 1: 18, which means *vehement displeasure, severe punishment, fierce flames*. Both *ἐκδοχή* and *ζῆλος* are nominatives to *ἀπολείπεται* understood. *Ἐσθίειν*, *consume, devour, destroy*, like the Hebrew אָכַל, Deut. 32: 22. So Homer, Il. xxiii. 182, *πάντας πῦρ ἐσθίει*. *Ὑπεναντίους* designates all *who oppose themselves* to the character, claims, and kingdom of Christ.

28. *Ἀθετήσας τις ἀποθνήσκει*, *whosoever violated the law of Moses, suffered death without mercy, in case there were two or three witnesses*. The meaning is not, that *every* transgression of the Mosaic law was punishable with death, but that in all the cases, which were of a capital nature, death without reprieve or pardon was inflicted, where sufficient testimony could be had. See Num. 15: 30, 31.

Ἐπὶ δυσὶν ἢ τρισὶ μάρτυσιν, see Deut. 17: 6. 19: 15. The Hebrew עַל פִּי is rendered *ἐπί* by the Seventy; and well, for *ἐπί* denotes, *in case that, on the condition that*, any thing is done or happens. The meaning plainly is, 'provided two or three witnesses testify to a crime worthy of death.'

29. *Πόσῳ, δοκεῖτε καταπατήσας*, *of how much sorer punishment, think ye, shall he be counted worthy, who hath trodden under foot the Son of God*. *Δοκεῖτε* implies an appeal, on the part

of the writer, to the conscience and judgment of his readers, who, it is taken for granted, will decide according to his own views, in respect to the point in question. Ἀξιωθήσεται is applied either to desert of reward or of punishment; just as we say, in English, 'The man is worthy of reward,' or, 'worthy of death.'

Καταπατήσας signifies, *to treat with contempt, to spurn at, to treat with contumely.* Apostasy from the Christian religion implies this; and the peculiar criminality of it is here argued, from the superior claims which Christ has, on every account, to regard and fidelity.

Καὶ τὸ αἷμα ἡγιάσθη, *and hath regarded the blood of the covenant, by which he hath been consecrated, as unclean.* The mode of expression is taken from the Jewish rites. When the people of Israel renewed their covenant with God, Moses sprinkled them with blood, Heb. 9: 19, 20. Ex. 24: 8. This is called *the blood of the covenant.* So under the new covenant, when Christians are consecrated to the service of Christ, and make an open profession of his religion, (as the people of Israel did of theirs), they are figuratively said to be sprinkled or cleansed with the blood of Jesus; comp. Heb. 9: 14. 10: 22. 13: 20. 1 Cor. 11: 25. 1 John 1: 7. 1 Pet. 1: 19. Rev. 1: 5. And as they enter into covenant with Christ, at such a time, pledging themselves to obedience and fidelity, so the blood with which they are said to be sprinkled, is called the *blood of the covenant.* The *sense* of the expression is plainly *spiritual*, but the *form* of it is borrowed from the Jewish ritual.

Κοινὸν ἡγησάμενος, regarding it as *common* or *unclean*, i. e. as blood not consecrated, but like any common blood; therefore, as having no consecrating or cleansing power, as not having set apart those, who were sprinkled with it, for the peculiar service of God in the gospel, nor laid them under peculiar obligations to be devoted to the cause of Christ.

Ἐν ᾧ ἡγιάσθη, *by which he has been consecrated*, i. e. to Christ, set apart for his service; another expression borrowed from the Jewish rite of consecrating things to the service of God in the temple, by sprinkling them with blood. See on 9: 22.

Καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς χάριτος ἐνυβρίσας, *and hath done despite to the Spirit of grace.* Ἐνυβρίσας designates the idea of *treating with spite*, or *malignity*, or *contempt*; and is nearly equivalent to καταπατήσας above. Πνεῦμα τῆς χάριτος means, either the *gra-*

cious Spirit, or *the Spirit who bestows grace*, i. e. religious, spiritual favours and gifts. Comp. 1 Cor. 12: 4—11. But many commentators interpret *πνεῦμα τῆς χάριτος*, as meaning simply *grace* or *gospel blessings*. But this does not accord with the idiom of our epistle; comp. 6: 4, where apostates are described as having been *μετόχους πνεύματος ἁγίου*. The question, however, whether *πνεῦμα* here means *agent* or *influence*, is not so easily settled; for the sense is good and apposite, interpreted in either way. I incline to adopt the former meaning.

30. This awful warning the apostle follows up with a quotation from Scripture, descriptive of the tremendous nature of the punishment threatened. *Οἴδαμεν γὰρ κύριος*, *surely, we know him who hath said, To me belongeth punishment, I will inflict it.* The passage is quoted from Deut. 32: 35, לִי נָקָם וְשִׁלֵּם, *to me belongeth punishment and retribution.* *Ἐκδίκησις*, like the Hebrew נָקָם, literally means *vengeance, revenge.* But as this is evidently spoken of God only *ἀνθρωποπαθῶς*, the meaning is, that God does that which is analogous to what men do when they avenge themselves, i. e. he inflicts *punishment.* The idea is rendered intense, by the subsequent intimation, that the almighty, eternal God will inflict such punishment.

Λέγει κύριος are words of the apostle, not of the Hebrew Scriptures, and are probably added here, to shew the end of the quotation made, and to enforce the threatening; for in the same way, the Hebrew prophets often expressed themselves when they uttered comminations, adding to them נְאֻם יְהוָה, *thus saith Jehovah.*

Καὶ πάλιν λαὸν αὐτοῦ, *and again, "The Lord will judge his people."* This quotation may be either from Deut. 32: 36, or Ps. 135: 14, both places containing the same expression. If it be from the former place, then it is on account of the clauses that intervene between the first quotation and this, that the writer says, *καὶ πάλιν*. If from the latter, then the reason for subjoining *καὶ πάλιν*, is still more evident.

Κρινεῖ means here, as often, *to pass sentence of condemnation, to subject to punishment, to punish.* The corresponding *στίχος* in the Hebrew clearly shews that such is the sense of the original יָדִין; for it runs thus, both in Deut. 32: 36 and Ps. 135: 14, וְעַל עֲבָדָיו יִתְנֶחָם, *and on his servants will he take vengeance.* Probably the expression in Ps. 135: 14, is a mere quotation of Deut. 32: 36.

31. Well may the writer add, *φοβερὸν ζῶντος, it is a fearful thing, to fall into the hands of the living God.* *Ἐμπεσεῖν εἰς τὰς χεῖρας,* נָפַל בְּיַד, means, *to be at the disposal of his vindictive power*, i. e. of his punitive justice. It is a Hebraistic mode of expression, for the classic writers say, *πεσεῖν ὑπὸ τὰς χεῖρας.* *Ζῶντος* probably here means, *ever-living*, as it commonly does elsewhere, when applied to God. This idea, moreover, augments the dreadful nature of the punishment; which is altogether apposite to the writer's design.

32. The writer now proceeds to enforce his admonition against apostasy, by holding up to the Hebrews encouragement to persevere from the experience of former days, when they remained steadfast amid many trials and sufferings.

Ἀναμιμνήσκεσθε δὲ τὰς πρότερον παθημάτων, call to mind, now, former days, in which, after ye were enlightened, ye endured a great contest with sufferings. That is, 'Faint not, be not discouraged, at the prospect of trials. Look back to the time, when ye patiently endured severer trials than ye now suffer, and still persevered.' Continue to do as you have already done.'

Ἡμέρας, like the Hebrew יָמִים, is often used for *time, season*, indefinitely. *Φωτισθέντες* refers to the illumination which they received, when the knowledge of the Christian religion was first imparted to them. What the *ἄθλησις παθημάτων* was, is explained in the verses which follow.

33. *Τοῦτο μὲν θεατριζόμενοι, partly because ye were made a public spectacle, both by reproaches and afflictions.* *Τοῦτο μὲν τοῦτο δὲ* correspond, and when thus related bear the sense which is here given to them. *Ὀνειδισμοῖς* refers to the reproachful appellations and language, addressed to Christians by their persecutors; *θλίψεσι*, to the various sufferings inflicted upon them by the same. In this way, they were exposed to public view, *θεατριζόμενοι*, i. e. held up to the world as persons worthy of reproach and ill-treatment, or made a spectacle to the world as sufferers of these things, and thus loaded with disgrace.

Τοῦτο δὲ γενηθέντας, and partly, because ye were associated with those who were thus treated. That is, a part of their *ἄθλησις* consisted in the sympathy which they were called to exercise towards others, who were reproached and persecuted. *Ἀναστρέφομαι* I have rendered as having a passive sense here,

viz. *who were thus treated;* and so many critics render it. Still it would be difficult to find a classical example of giving to this verb a *passive* sense, inasmuch as it is commonly used in the *middle* voice, and employed as a verb neuter deponent. I have translated *ad sensum.*

34. *Καὶ γὰρ συνεπαθήσατε, for ye did truly sympathize with those who were prisoners.* Instead of *δεσμίοις, prisoners,* some manuscripts and editions, with several of the fathers, have *δεσμοῖς μου*; which is the reading of the received text, and is preferred by Matthiae, Michaelis, Carpzoff, Noesselt, and others. But *δεσμίοις* has the weight of authority in its favour; it is sufficiently consonant with the context; and it is, perhaps, on the whole, more natural to suppose the writer to have spoken of "sympathizing with prisoners," than "with bonds." There is no important objection, however, to the latter expression; and if Paul be the writer of our epistle, *δεσμοῖς μου* gives a very emphatic meaning.

Καὶ τὴν ἁρπαγὴν προσεδέξασθε, and cheerfully endured the plundering of your own property. This was a part of the *θλίψεις,* which they had suffered in former times.

Γινώσκοντες ἔχειν μένουσαν, knowing that ye have for yourselves, in heaven, a possession of a better and more lasting nature. *Ἑαυτοῖς, dativus commodi.* *Ὑπαρξιν, any thing possessed, estate, property.* *Κρείττονα, better* than earthly possessions, i. e. spiritual, heavenly, not material and earthly. *Μένουσαν, enduring, permanent,* not perishable, fleeting, temporary, like all earthly possessions.

35. *Μὴ ἀποβάλητε μεγάλην, cast not away then your confidence, which will obtain a great reward.* That is, act as you formerly did, and thus gain possession of the *κρείττονα καὶ μένουσαν ὕπαρξιν.*

36. *Ὑπομονῆς γὰρ ἐπαγγελίαν, ye have need, no doubt, of patience, in order that when ye have done the will of God, ye may receive the promised blessing.* *Patience* they needed, because of the many trials and temptations, to which they were still exposed. *Γὰρ, surely, truly,* and (which is equivalent) *it is true, no doubt.* The writer means as much as to say, 'I readily concede, that *patience* is requisite, in your present circumstances, in order that you should persevere.' *To do the will of God,* here, is to obey the

requirement to believe and trust in Christ. *Ἐπαγγελίαν, thing promised, reward proffered;* for the *promise itself* they had already received. *Ἐπαγγελίαν* here, and *μισθαποδοσίαν* in v. 35, both refer to the *ὕπαρξιν κρείττονα καὶ μένουσαν* mentioned in v. 34, and which is there represented as promised to them, in case of obedience.

37. *Ἔτι γὰρ μικρὸν χρονιεῖ, however, yet a very little while, and he who is coming will come, and will not delay.* That is, the Messiah (*ὁ ἐρχόμενος*) will speedily come, and, by destroying the Jewish power, put an end to the sufferings which your persecutors inflict upon you. Comp. Matt. xxiv. *Ὅσον ὅσον* is an intensive form of expression, which is applied either to things great or small, like מְאֹד, מְאֹד. It is employed in the like way, however, by the classic Greek authors. The whole phrase resembles that in Hab. 2: 3, כִּי בֹא יָבֹא לֹא יְאַחֵר *for it* (viz. the vision) *will surely come to pass, it will not delay.* If, however, it be an actual quotation, the application of the words is different from that of the original, and the writer designed merely to use the language to express his own ideas. In fact, the Septuagint version of the passage in Habakkuk, differs slightly from the words used by the apostle. It runs thus, *ὅτι ἐρχόμενος ἥξει, καὶ οὐ μὴ χρονίσῃ.* It seems quite probable, (considering the quotation from Hab. 2: 4, which follows), that the apostle had the Hebrew expression above quoted in his mind. But it seems equally plain, also, that he has made use of it only as the medium of expressing his own particular idea, and not as a designed quotation used according to the exact idea of the original. I have marked it as a quotation, however, in my version, because the *words* appear to be quoted.

38. *Ὁ δὲ δίκαιος ἐκ πίστεως ζήσεται, the just, too, shall live by faith.* In Hab. 2: 4, it is וְצַדִּיק בֶּאֱמוּנָתוֹ יִחְיֶה׃ which (if rendered according to the accents) will be, *The just by faith shall live,* i. e. the just man who has faith shall be preserved. The expression in our verse is capable of the same translation, and Dr. Knapp has pointed it so as to be construed in this way. But I apprehend, after all, that this is not the meaning of either the Hebrew or Greek phrase. *Faith* is put here as the means of preservation, in opposition to *apostasy* or defection, in the other part of the verse, which is the means of destruction or disapprobation. 'A persevering confidence or belief in Christ,' (the writer means to say), 'will be

the means of preservation, when the Lord shall come to execute his judgments upon the Jewish nation.' So the Seventy understood the phrase, which they have rendered, *ὁ δὲ δίκαιος ἐκ πίστεώς μου ζήσεται*; as if they read בֶּאֱמוּנָתִי instead of בֶּאֱמוּנָתוֹ. The meaning of *ἐκ πίστεώς μου*, must of course be, *by faith* or *confidence in me*, which expresses the condition of being saved, rather than the peculiar character of the person who is saved. I understand the expression, in Hebrew and in our epistle, in a similar way. If the apostle meant to quote here, it is evident that he has not adhered to the text of the Septuagint.

Καὶ ἐὰν ὑποστείληται ἐν αὐτῷ, but if any one draw back, my soul hath no pleasure in him. I hesitate whether to translate *καὶ* here as the disjunctive *but*, or to consider it as an elliptical expression for *καὶ λέγει*, i. e. *καὶ λέγει ὁ Θεός* vel *ἡ γραφή*. The latter resembles the usage of this epistle; see 1: 10. 10: 17. The former sense, (*καὶ but*), is quite common in the New Testament writers. Either method of interpretation is consistent with idiom, and with the scope of the writer. I have, on the whole, preferred the *antithetic* form of the sentence, and rendered *καὶ, but.*

Ἐὰν ὑποστείληται κ. τ. λ. seems plainly to be a quotation from Hab. 2: 4. The apostle, however, has changed the order of the verse, quoting the latter part of it first, and the former part last. The original Hebrew runs thus, הִנֵּה עֻפְלָה לֹא יָשְׁרָה נַפְשׁוֹ בּוֹ, *behold the scornful, his mind shall not be happy*; or (as Gesenius translates) *See! he whose soul is unbelieving shall, on account of this, be unhappy.* The Seventy, who have rendered the Hebrew in exact accordance with the words of our epistle, must have read נַפְשִׁי here, as they did בֶּאֱמוּנָתִי in the clause preceding. This is the more probable reading, but it cannot now be critically defended. We can only say, therefore, that the quotation of the apostle is, on general grounds, *ad sensum*, but not *ad literam*. The sentiment of the Hebrew, is, that the scorner or unbeliever of that day should be unhappy; the sentiment of the apostle, that the unbeliever, i. e. the apostate Christian who renounces his religion, shall incur divine disapprobation. The same *sentiment* lies at the foundation, in both cases. Such disapprobation the last clause expresses, *οὐκ εὐδοκεῖ ἡ ψυχή μου ἐν αὐτῷ*, where the negative form of expression is employed, (as often in sacred and also classical writ-

ings), instead of the affirmative, i. e. 'he shall be an object of my displeasure.'

39. *Ἡμεῖς δὲ οὐκ ἀπωλειαν, but we are not of those who draw back to destruction.* Ὑποστολῆς is the abstract noun, *shrinking back, timidity, withdrawing;* and (as is common) the *abstract* is here put for the *concrete*, i. e. for persons who withdrew or shrink back, viz. from their Christian profession. The consequence of such withdrawing is ἀπώλεια; see vs. 26, 27.

Ἀλλὰ πίστεως, εἰς περιποίησιν ψυχῆς, but of those who believe, to the salvation of the soul. Περιποίησιν means lit. *obtaining, acquiring, possessing.* But as it is here placed in antithesis to ἀπώλειαν, it plainly means, *saving*, or *salvation.* Πίστεως, *faith, belief*, is an *abstract* noun used instead of a *concrete*, in the same manner as ὑποστολῆς above.

Having mentioned *faith*, or *belief, confidence*, as a peculiar and most important characteristic of those who persevere in the Christian religion, so as to secure their salvation; the writer now proceeds, with great force and propriety, to make his appeal to the Old Testament Scriptures, in order to shew that *faith* or *confidence* in the divine promises has, in all ages, been the means of perseverance in true religion, and consequently of salvation. In 10: 34—39, the apostle had exhorted his readers to persevere in waiting for the rewards of a future world, ὕπαρξιν ἐν οὐρανοῖς κρείττονα καὶ μένουσαν μισθαποδοσίαν μεγάλην τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν. He now goes on to shew more fully, that the very nature of *faith* and the character of *believers* demand this. All *believers*, in every age, have done so; and the Hebrews ought to follow their example. See on the nature of the faith, brought to view in this chapter, Vol. I. p. 184. e. seq.

CHAP. XI.

1. The general nature of *faith* is first explained. Ἔστι δὲ πίστις . . . βλεπομένων, *now faith is confidence in respect to things hoped for*, [and] *convincing evidence of things not seen.* Ὑπόστασις, *confidence, confident expectation.* Others, with Chrysostom, 'Faith gives reality or substance to things hoped for.' The sense is good; but the shade of meaning is not exactly hit. If this were the idea of ὑπόστασις, we might expect the antithetic word to be ἀσωμάτων or ἀνύλων, *incorporeal* or *immaterial things*, instead of ἐλπιζομένων. The use of ὑπόστασις, in the sense of *confidence*, etc. belongs to the later Greek, and is frequent in the New Testament. This sense is evidently appropriate here. The writer had just been exhorting his readers not to cast away their *confidence* or *boldness*, which would ensure a great reward, 10: 35. If any one should object to this exhortation, that the objects of reward were all *future* and *unseen;* the reply is, that 'the very nature of belief or faith, implies confidence in respect to objects of this nature. All the patriarchs and prophets possessed *such* faith.' Ἐλπιζομένων means, *things future which are the objects of hope*, and not of present fruition. The things future, are the rewards which have just been mentioned above.

Ἔλεγχος, *demonstration, proof, convincing evidence.* This last idea I have expressed in the translation. The meaning is, that faith in the divine word and promises, is equivalent to, or supplies the place of, proof or demonstration, in regard to the objects of the unseen world, i. e. it satisfies the mind respecting their reality and importance, as proof or demonstration is wont to do.

That the faith here brought to view, and adverted to through chap. xi. is not *specifically* what some theologians call *saving faith*, viz. faith in Christ, in an appropriate and *limited* sense, is evident from the nature of the examples which are subjoined by the writer.; e. g. vs. 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 11, etc. In this chapter, faith is *belief* or *confidence* generally in divine declarations, of whatever nature they may be; for it does not always have respect even to *promises*, or to the *future*; e. g. v. 3. Now the same confidence in what God declares, respecting subjects of such a nature as are brought to view in this chapter, would lead the person who exercises it, to confidence in all which God might declare respecting the Messiah, and consequently to belief in Christ. It is then called, by theologians, *saving faith*. But it should be remembered, that this is only a convenient *technical* phrase of modern theology; not one employed by the sacred writers. The true and essential nature of faith, is *confidence in God, belief in his declarations;* and whether this be exercised by believing in the Scripture account of the creation of the world; or, as Abel, Enoch, Noah, Abraham, Sarah, and others, exercised it, in respect to specific objects; or, by believing on the Messiah; it is evidently *the same disposition of mind*, in all cases. It is *confidence in God.* It is, therefore, with perfect propriety, that our author here excites the Hebrews to persevere in their Christian faith, by various examples which exhibit the power of faith in the ancient worthies, as a principle of pious and virtuous belief and action.

2. *Ἐν ταύτῃ γὰρ πρεσβύτεροι, on account of this, moreover, the ancients were commended. Μαρτυρέω* not unfrequently means, *to applaud, praise, commend, openly signify approbation.* See Wahl's Lex. no. 2. This is evidently the sense of the word here.

3. *Πίστει νοοῦμεν γεγονέναι, by faith, we perceive that the worlds were formed by the word of God, so that the things which are seen were not made from those which appear. Πίστει, confidence* in the account which the Scriptures (viz. Gen. i.) give of the creation. It is confidence in *God*, too; for there could be no other witness of what was then done; at least there could be none of the human race. *Νοοῦμεν, we perceive, apprehend, attain to an apprehension of. Καταρτίσθαι, ordinare, disponere*, not simply to create or bring into being, but also *to fit, prepare, form*, i. e. reduce to form and

order. *Αἰῶνας, worlds*, i. e. the universe, עוֹלָמִים; see on Heb. 1: 2. That *αἰῶνας*, in this case, cannot mean *seculum* or *aevum* is sufficiently plain; for in what tolerable sense could the writer say, that seculum or aevum *was not made ἐκ φαινομένων*, i. q. was made *ἐκ μὴ φαινομένων*, or, *out of nothing?* That the assertion in the negative form, is of the same import as if it were of the positive form, might be easily shewn by appeal to a multitude of the like cases of *λιτότης*, in the Scriptures. 'John confessed, and *denied not*, but confessed, John 1: 20;' where *οὐκ ἠρνήσατο* plainly conveys the same idea as *ὡμολόγησε*. As to classical usage, the commentary on the next clause may be consulted. In what sense, too, could *seculum* or *aevum* be called *βλεπόμενα*? 'This word means, *objects visible to the sight*, or, *palpable to the senses*, i. e. material objects. *Φαινόμενα* means the same thing; there being no more difference between the two words, in Greek, as characterising objects, than there is between *seen* and *apparent*, in English. The assertion of the writer then is, that 'visible objects, i. e. the visible creation, did not spring from objects that were apparent,' i. e. that the visible creation was not made out of matter before existing; which is the same as to say, that the world was created, brought into existence, by the word of God simply, and was not a mere reducing to order materials that before existed; see on the succeeding clause of the verse, in the sequel. At all events, the idea of a *seculum* or *aevum* 'being *framed* (*κατηρτίσθαι*) by the word of God,' presents an incongruity of which no example can be found in the sacred writers. Equally incongruous would *ἐποίησε τοὺς αἰῶνας*, in 1: 2, be, if *αἰών* were to be rendered *seculum*. *Ῥήματι θεοῦ, the command of God;* comp. Gen. 1: 3, 6, 9, 11, 14, 20, 24, 26. Ps. 33: 6. 2 Pet. 3: 5.

Εἰς τὸ μὴ ἐκ φαινομένων τὰ βλεπόμενα γεγονέναι, a controverted, and somewhat difficult expression. If we construe it as the text now stands, the *μή* must naturally be joined with *γεγονέναι*, and it must be rendered, *so that things visible were not made of things which do appear*. Accordingly, Pierce insists on this construction, and maintains that the sense is, 'So that things visible might appear not to have been made of things apparent, i. e. out of pre-existing matter.'

Those who adopt a different construction of the passage maintain, that *εἰς τὸ μὴ ἐκ φαινομένων* may be translated, as if it were

written *εἰς τὸ ἐκ μὴ φαινομένων*. That such a metathesis of the negative *μή*, or its equivalent *οὐ, οὐκ*, is allowable, or at least that it is not uncommon, they endeavour to shew by appealing to examples; e. g. 2 Macc. 7: 28, *ὅτι οὐκ ἐξ ὄντων ἐποίησεν αὐτὰ ὁ θεός*, which plainly means, 'God made them [heaven and earth] from things that do not exist,' i. e. out of nothing. So Arrian, de exp. Alex. VII. 23, "These things I do not blame, unless that *οὐκ ἐπὶ μεγάλοις μεγάλως διεσπουδάζετο, he was too much occupied with small matters;*" where *οὐκ* seems to qualify *μεγάλως*. Plutarch, Paedagog. IX. 15, "I should say that promptitude of speaking on any matter is not to be altogether disapproved; nor, on the other hand, *ταύτην οὐκ ἐπ' ἀξίοις ἀσκεῖν, is it to be practised in respect to trifling subjects.*" So the Greek *οὐκ ἔφη εἶναι, he said he would not come*. Arrian, Anab. I. 5, 4 *οὐκ ἔφη χρῆναι ἐν λόγῳ τίθεσθαι Αὐταριάτας, he said that the Autariatae were not to be put into the account*. Polyb. p. 1331, *τοὺς μὴ φάσκοντας ἀπολύειν, saying that they were not to be absolved*. If the examples where *φημί* is used, be abstracted from the others, there are still a sufficient number, they aver, to shew that a metathesis of the negative particle *μή*, is not without parallels.

Chrysostom also transposed *μή* here, and found no difficulty in it. He paraphrases it thus, *ἐξ οὐκ ὄντων τὰ ὄντα ἐποίησεν ὁ θεός· ἐκ τῶν μὴ φαινομένων, τὰ φαινόμενα· ἐκ τῶν μὴ ὑφεστώτων, τὰ ὑφεστῶτα*. So the Vulgate, Erasmus, Luther, Wolfius, and most of the later interpreters.

That the metathesis of *μή*, in this case, so as to construe it in connexion with *φαινομένων*, may be admissible, there can, indeed, be but little doubt. Yet it is, after all, unnecessary; for the phrase plainly has the same meaning, when translated agreeably to its present arrangement, if the nature of such a *λιτότης* be well understood. There is no need of understanding the examples cited from the classics, in a different way. And indeed, take them which way we will, (either by way of metathesis in respect to the *οὐκ* or *μή*, or of joining the negative with the verb or participle that follows), the sense, all must admit, is plain, and is substantially one and the same. These examples, it must also be admitted, cast sufficient light upon the sense of the passage Heb. 11: 3, so as to require no hesitation about admitting a meaning so well supported by parallel examples, and which, indeed, the context seems to demand.

We may also compare phraseology of a like nature, to be found in other parts of Paul's writings. In Rom. 4: 17, he says, "God restores the dead to life, and calls τὰ μὴ ὄντα ὡς ὄντα," i. e. summons [to fulfil his own purposes] things that do not exist, as though they did exist. In like manner, Philo, in Lib. de creat. mundi, p. 728, says, τὰ γὰρ μὴ ὄντα ἐκάλησεν ὁ θεὸς εἰς τὸ εἶναι, *things which existed not, God called into existence.* That μὴ φαινομένων is equivalent to μὴ ὄντων, needs not to be formally proved. So in Hebrew, נִמְצָא *quod invenitur*, is a customary expression for *ens*, or *existens;* and אֵינוֹ נִמְצָא, for *res non existens, nihilum.*

On the whole, then, we must regard the phrase in question as equivalent to the expression in our language, 'The visible creation was formed from nothing,' i. e. it came into existence by the command of God, and was not formed out of any pre-existing materials. *Deus ex nihilo mundum fecit*, conveys the same idea. Such a phrase does not mean, that *nothing* was the *materiel*, out of which the world was constructed, for there would be no sense in this; but it merely denies that any such *materiel* existed. This entirely agrees with the preceding clause of the text, which asserts that the command of God brought the universe into existence; and this is altogether confirmed by Gen. 1. Here Moses represents, in v. 1, the heavens and earth as first brought into existence by divine power, and afterwards as *formed* and *arranged* into their present order; comp. Gen. 1: 1, with Gen. 1: 2 and the sequel of the chapter. In fact, if the *manner* of assertion in our text be strictly scanned, it will be found to be more exact and philosophical, than the Latin *ex nihilo Deus mundum fecit*, or the English, *God made the world out of nothing.* Each of these phrases presents the *seeming* incongruity of asserting, that nothing was the *materiel* out of which the world was made. But our author is more strictly conformed to philosophical propriety, when he says, 'Things visible were not made out of things that are visible,' i. e. the visible creation was brought into existence by the word or command of God simply, and was not formed or fitted up out of any pre-existing materials. Exactly so do we find the assertion in 2 Macc. 7: 28, οὐκ ἐξ ὄντων ἐποίησεν αὐτὰ ὁ θεὸς, *God did not make them* [heaven and earth] *out of things existing*, i. e. he strictly created them.

Well may it be suggested, that faith in the *divine* word was requisite to believe this; inasmuch as Thales, Plato, Aristotle, and

other eminent philosophers who followed not the *divine* word, indulged in speculations about the creation of the world, which were either very visionary, or quite different from the view which Moses has given.

4. *Πίστει πλείονα τῷ θεῷ, by faith Abel offered to God a better sacrifice than Cain. Πλείονα better, more excellent*; so frequently, e. g. Matt. 6: 25. Luke 12: 23. Matt. 12: 41, 45. Mark 12: 33. Luke 11: 31. Heb. 3: 3. Rev. 2: 19.

On what account the sacrifice of Abel was more acceptable, commentators have speculated much, and assigned a great variety of causes. But it may be asked, Does not our text contain a solution of this question? Abel made his offering *in faith*; the implication is, that Cain did not.

Δι' ἧς ἐμαρτυρήθη θεοῦ, on account of which [faith], *he was declared to be righteous, God himself commending his oblations. How* this was done, is not said in Gen. 4: 4. But most probably it was by fire sent from heaven, which consumed the sacrifice; comp. Gen. 15: 17. Lev. 9: 24. Judg. 6: 21. 1 Chron. 21: 26. 27: 1. 1 K. 18: 38. The appellation *δίκαιος* is given to Abel, in Matt. 23: 35. 1 John 3: 12.

Καὶ δι' αὐτῆς ἀποθανὼν ἔτι λαλεῖ, and by it, though dead, he continues to speak. Δι' αὐτῆς, viz. by his faith. *Λαλεῖ* and *λαλεῖται* are both supported by good authorities. The latter is preferred by Grotius, Hammond, Schmidt, Valkenaer, Michaelis, Storr, Rosenmueller, Bengel, Griesbach, Schulz, etc; the former, by Wetstein, Matthiae, Heinrichs, Knapp, etc. and has the majority of manuscripts, versions, and editions, in its favour. Where the balance of authority is, on the whole, nearly equal, I cannot well hesitate to prefer *λαλεῖ* to *λαλεῖται*. The sense of the latter would be equivalent to *μαρτυρεῖται*, sc. *laudatur, is commended*. But this idea has been twice suggested before in the same verse, by *μαρτυρεῖται* and *μαρτυροῦντος θεοῦ*. It is hardly probable that it would be a third time repeated. But *λαλεῖ*, I apprehend, has reference to Gen. 4: 10, where the 'voice of Abel's blood is said to cry to God from the ground.' In Heb. 12: 14, also, our author represents the blood of Christ and of Abel as *speaking*, *λαλοῦντι*. The *form* of expression only, in our verse, seems to be borrowed from the thought in Gen. 4: 10; for here it is the *faith* of Abel which makes him speak after his death, viz. he speaks, by his faith,

to those who should come after him, exhorting and encouraging them to follow his example. In other words, his example of faith affords admonition and instruction to succeeding ages.

5. *Πίστει Ἐνὼχ ὁ θεός, by faith Enoch was translated, that he might not see death; and he was no more found, because God had translated him. Τοῦ μὴ ἰδεῖν* is equivalent here to *εἰς τὸ μὴ ἰδεῖν*, or *διὰ τὸ μὴ ἰδεῖν*. The Hebrew has לָקַח אֹתוֹ אֱלֹהִים *God took him*, where our author uses *μετέθηκε*. The original, in Gen. 5: 24, says nothing respecting the point, whether Enoch was translated alive, or after death. *Καὶ οὐχ εὑρίσκετο* is the Septuagint version of the Hebrew וְאֵינֶנּוּ, *he was not*, sc. he was no more among men. The idea, in the Hebrew and Greek, is for substance the same; for *οὐχ εὑρίσκετο* means, *he was no more to be met with, he was no longer extant*, (לֹא נִמְצָא) *among men*. But all the Targumists, viz. Onkelos, Jonathan, and the author of the Jerusalem Targum, understand Enoch to have been translated without dying. So the Comment. Bereschith Rabba, parasch. 25. f. 28. So, probably, the Son of Sirach, 49: 14. I may add, that this is a very natural deduction, from the brief notice of Enoch's translation in Gen. 5: 24. *Early* death is commonly represented, in the Old Testament, as the punishment of sin; and that "the wicked should not live out half their days," was the persuasion of most good men in ancient times. If then Enoch died before translation, how could his removal to another world have been regarded as an evidence of his extraordinary piety? The texts to which Dindorf has appealed, in his notes added to the commentary of Ernesti, are very far from supporting the position, that the ancient Jews regarded premature death, as a testimony of heaven in favour of him who was the subject of it. Nor is there any need of Rosenmueller's concession here, viz. that the apostle, in his account of Enoch's removal, has accommodated himself to the Jewish traditionary opinions. It may indeed be, that a tradition existed among the Jews, that Enoch "did not see death." But that this was founded in *fact*, seems to be plainly deducible from the manner of the narration in Hebrew, and the state of opinion, in ancient times, respecting *early* death.

Προὸ γὰρ τῆς τῷ θεῷ, he is commended, also, as having pleased God before his translation. The Hebrew says, וַיִּתְהַלֵּךְ חֲנוֹךְ אֶת־הָאֱלֹהִים *and Enoch walked with God*, which denotes a

state of communion and friendship with God, and implies, of course, a complacency in the divine mind with respect to him. The apostle, therefore, appeals to the *sense* of the Scriptures, in this case, and not to the *words*. Nor does he mean to say, that the testimony respecting Enoch's pleasing God was given before his translation; but that testimony given, viz. in the divine word, respects his having pleased God before his translation. *Εὐαρεστέω* governs the dative.

6. The writer now suggests the grounds, on which he builds the conclusion, that Enoch was translated on account of his *faith*; viz, *χωρὶς δὲ πίστεως εὐαρεστῆσαι, but without faith, it is impossible to please* [him.] The truth of this he rests upon his own declaration, and the common opinion on this subject, which he trusted that all his readers entertained.

Πιστεῦσαι γὰρ δεῖ γίνεται, for he who cometh to God, must believe that he exists, and that he will reward those who seek him. Προσερχόμενον τῷ θεῷ designates *him who worships God, Dei cultorem*; see 7: 25. The phraseology is probably derived from going up to the temple to worship, in the sanctuary of which God dwelt, by his peculiar presence. Some have understood the phrase as referring to an approach to God in the invisible world, in heaven; but the idea here is like that expressed by the Hebrew phrases, *going to God, returning to him* etc. which usually denote, 'approach in the present world to his spiritual presence.'

Τοῖς ἐκζητοῦσιν αὐτόν, comp. the Hebrew דֹּרְשֵׁי אֱלֹהִים, אֱלֹהִים בַּקֵּשׁ, which are employed to designate the worship and prayers of those, who are piously devoted to the service of God.

The two fundamental truths of all that can properly be called religion, are here adverted to. The first is, a belief that God exists; the second, that he is the moral governor of the universe, i. e. that he rewards those who are pious, and, consequently, punishes those who are not so. He who denies this, denies all that sanctions religion, and makes it binding upon the consciences of men.

7. *Πίστει οἴκου αὐτοῦ, by faith Noah, being divinely admonished respecting the future, with reverence prepared an ark for the safety of his household. Χρηματισθείς*, comp. 8: 5 and Gen. 6: 13, 14. 7: 1—5. *Μηδέπω βλεπομένων*, i. e. the future flood, no signs of which were as yet visible. *Εὐλαβηθείς* may be taken either in the sense of *fearing*, viz. the destruction which was com-

ing; or it may be understood of the *reverence* which he paid to the divine admonition. I have translated it as bearing the latter sense, since this makes most directly for the apostle's object, which is to exhibit the faith which Noah exercised with regard to the divine warning.

Εἰς σωτηρίαν, for the saving, or *safety*. It is often applied to temporal security or deliverance, like the Hebrew יְשׁוּעָה.

Δι' ἧς κατέκρινε κληρονόμος, by which [faith] *he condemned the world, and obtained the justification which is by faith.* Ἧς I refer to *πίστεως*, as do Sykes, Heinrichs, Dindorf, and others. *Κόσμον* means, *wicked men, men of a mere worldly spirit*; as often, in the New Testament. Noah *condemned* these, by an example of faith in the divine warnings, while the world around him remained impenitent and unbelieving. In other words, his conduct condemned theirs.

Ἐγένετο κληρονόμος, i. q. ἐκληρονόμησε, i. e. *obtained, acquired, became possessor of*. So Abraham is, in like manner, said to be justified by *faith* or *belief*, in Rom. iv., viz. belief in the promise of God respecting a future seed. On account of Noah's *faith*, he was counted צַדִּיק, *δίκαιος*, (comp. v. 4 above), or, he was regarded, treated, as *δίκαιος*.

From this verse, then, we may conclude, that faith may be of a justifying nature, i. e. such as is connected with the justification or pardon of the individual who exercises it, without being specifically directed to Christ as its object; for here, the object of Noah's faith was, the divine admonitions and comminations in regard to the flood. This only serves to shew, that faith, in its *generic* nature, has been the same in every age; and that it is, essentially, *a practical belief in divine declarations*.

8. *Πίστει καλούμενος κληρονομίαν, by faith Abraham obeyed, when called to go forth unto the place, which he was to receive for a possession.* See Gen. 12: 1—4. *Καλούμενος, summoned, invited, bid.* Ἐξελθεῖν, viz. from his own country and kindred, Gen. 12: 1. *Τόπον* means, *the land of Canaan, Palestine*, the future possession of which was promised to him. His *faith*, in this case, was manifested by believing in this promise.

Καὶ ἐξῆλθε ἔρχεται, yea, he went forth, not knowing whither he was going. Καὶ ἐξῆλθε adds intensity to the preceding *ὑπήκουσε*; and I have translated it accordingly. The mean-

ing is, 'he even went out, ignorant of the place to which he was going;' which serves to give a higher idea of the strength of Abraham's faith, than if we should suppose him to be well informed respecting the land of Canaan, before he went to it.

9. *Πίστει παρῴκησεν ἀλλοτρίαν, by faith he sojourned in the land of promise, while it belonged to strangers. Πίστει, by faith* he did this, i. e. by confidence in the promises, which God had made respecting the future possession of this land and respecting his offspring, he was moved to sojourn in Canaan, while it belonged to foreigners. *Ὡς, while, when*, as often; see Wahl. *Ἀλλοτρίαν* means, *that which belongs to another, quod alieni est, non sui.*

Ἐν σκηναῖς κατοικήσας αὐτῆς, dwelling in tents, with Isaac and Jacob, who were likewise heirs of the same promise. That is, the promise was made to Abraham and his seed. What was not fulfilled in him, was to have its accomplishment in them. Hence *συγκληρονόμων, fellow-heirs, joint-possessors*, viz. with Abraham; the same promise being made to them as to him, respecting the land of Canaan, and their future posterity.

10. *Ἐξεδέχετο γὰρ θεός, for he expected a city which hath foundations, whose builder and maker is God. Θεμελίους ἔχουσαν, firmly built, well-founded.* The plural, *θεμελίους*, augments the idea of firmness of construction. *Δημιουργός* means, originally, *one who labours for the public good*, from *δήμιος publicus, ad populum pertinens*, and *ἔργον opus*. Hence, secondarily, it is transferred to designate *a labourer* or *artificer* of any kind. It is often applied by the heathen writers to designate the Divinity; and by Philo, Josephus, and the Christian fathers, it is employed as an epithet of the true God. Here, however, it is used as nearly a synonyme of *τεχνίτης*; the latter conveying the idea of *a builder skilled in the rules* of *his art*, but *δημιουργός* meaning more simply, *maker, builder, fabricator.*

The meaning of the whole verse most evidently is, that Abraham looked for a permanent abode in the heavenly country, i. e. his hopes and expectations were placed upon the world to come. It was faith in this, which was *ἔλεγχος οὐ βλεπομένων*, and which moved him to obey the commands of God, and to do and suffer whatever he required. The fact, then, that saints under the Old Testament were moved, in their conduct, by considerations that

had respect to the invisible world or an immortal state of existence, is plainly implied here, by the reasoning of the apostle. See vs. 14, 16.

11. *Πίστει καὶ αὐτὴ ἔλαβε, by faith, also, Sarah herself received the power of conception. Πίστει, by faith*; how, or when? For when God announced to Abraham, that he should have a son by Sarah (Gen. 18: 10), she seems to have been in a state of unbelief, Gen. 18: 12. But although it is true that Sarah laughed on that occasion, and it must be admitted that this was occasioned partly by her incredulily, as Gen. 18: 13—15 shews; yet the same thing is affirmed of Abraham, Gen. 17: 17. The truth is, the first annunciation that a child would spring from them, occasioned, both in his and Sarah's mind, a feeling of incongruity, of impossibility that the course of nature should be so reversed. Subsequent consideration brought both to a full belief, in the reality of the promised future blessing. The history of this is not expressly given in Genesis, with respect to Sarah; but it is implied.

Καὶ αὐτὴ Σάῤῥα, Sarah herself also. Καὶ αὐτή, in this case, refers particularly to the fact that Sarah was barren, Gen. 16: 1, and that she was far advanced in old age, Gen. 18: 11. The meaning is, that faith gave even to Sarah, unpromising as her condition was in respect to offspring, the power of conception, i. e. by faith she obtained this blessing. *Εἰς καταβολὴν σπέρματος*, words tortured to the disgust of every delicate reader, by some of the critics. Even Wahl says, "she received strength *εἰς τὸ δέχεσθαι σπέρμα καταβεβλημένον* (i. e. by Abraham) *εἰς τὴν μήτραν*." Did this need any *supernatural* strength? I construe the phrase very differently. *Καταβολή* means, *foundation, commencement, beginning*. Now what is the foundation, or commencement *σπέρματος*, of offspring or progeny? Conception. The true idea of the phrase, then, appears to be fully given by the version above. In this view of the phrase, I observe, Dr. Schulz concurs, rendering *δύναμιν εἰς καταβολὴν σπέρματος*, by das Vermögen zur Empfängniss, *the power of conception.*

Καὶ παρὰ καιρὸν ἐπαγγειλάμενον, and this beyond the usual time of life; inasmuch as she regarded him as faithful, who had thus promised. Καὶ παρὰ καιρὸν, see Gen. 18: 11. *Ἐπεὶ πιστὸν κ. τ. λ*, which shews that the apostle considered it as quite certain, that Sarah, like her husband, did come to full confidence in the divine promise.

12. *Διὸ καὶ ἀφ' ἑνὸς πλήθει, wherefore, even from one who was dead too as to these things, there sprung* [a seed], *like the stars of heaven for multitude. Διό,* on account of which faith, viz. of Sarah, or perhaps, of Abraham and Sarah. *Καὶ ἀφ' ἑνός, even from a single individual,* is a designed antithesis to the *multitude* who are afterwards mentioned. Consequently it heightens the description. *Καὶ ταῦτα νενεκρωμένου* means, *incapable* (according to the ordinary laws of nature) *of procreation; καὶ νενεκρωμένου,* i. e. not only *one individual,* but one *dead also.* See the same description, in Rom. 4: 19. *Ταῦτα* is governed by *κατά* understood. *Καθὼς τὰ ἄστρα κ. τ. λ.* that is, a very great number; comp. Gen. 15: 5. 22: 17.

Καὶ ὡς ἡ ἄμμος ἀναρίθμητος, and like the sand upon the shore of the sea, which cannot be numbered, i. e. an exceedingly great multitude. *Χείλος θαλάσσης,* lit. *lip of the sea* which means the *shore.* So the word is used by profane Greek writers also; as *labium* is by the Latin ones. So the Hebrew שְׂפַת, Gen. 22: 17; which compare.

13. *Κατὰ πίστιν ἐπαγγελίας, these all died in faith, not having received the blessings promised. Οὗτοι πάντες*—who? Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, and Sarah, mentioned in vs. 8—12; for *οὗτοι* cannot well be here extended to all who are mentioned in the preceding part of the chapter, because the "promised blessings" were those, which were assured to the Hebrew patriarchs. *Ἐπαγγελίας,* not *promises,* (for these they had received), but *blessings promised,* according to the idiom of this epistle. What were these blessings, *heavenly* or *earthly?* The sequel will answer this question.

Ἀλλὰ πόρρωθεν γῆς, but seeing them afar off, and joyfully anticipating them, they openly professed themselves to be strangers and sojourners on the earth. The application of this whole verse, to the expectation of the future possession of Canaan, and of a numerous progeny, would be admissible, were it not for the sequel (vs. 14—16), which plainly forbids such an application. In addition to the faith of Abraham, and other patriarchs, in the promises of God which had respect to temporal blessings, I understand the apostle as here asserting, that those ancient worthies also exercised confidence in God's word, respecting the blessings of the invisible world; i. e. theirs was *ὑπόστασις ἐλπιζομένων οὐ βλεπομένων.* Those things which are invisible to the corporeal

eye, they saw with the eye of faith, and seeing, *hailed them with joy* (ἀσπασάμενοι), *welcomed them, greeted them* or *anticipated them with gladness*, as we *joyfully greet* or *anticipate* the approach of a beloved friend, or of some distinguished favour. And, looking forward to them as their chief source of happiness, *they openly declared themselves to be only strangers and sojourners in the present world.* That γῆς, by itself, might refer to the *land of Canaan*, is plain enough; but that it does so refer here, is rendered quite improbable by the sequel. The idea is plainly more general. Παρεπίδημος means, *a temporary resident among any people*, i. e. a sojourner.

14. *Οἱ γὰρ τοιαῦτα ἐπιζητοῦσι, now they, who thus profess, shew that they are yet seeking for a country. Ταῦτα λέγοντες*, viz. *saying* or *professing* that they were strangers and sojourners in the earth. *Πατρίδα, a fixed or permanent place of residence*, i. q. *πόλιν μένουσαν*, 13: 14, or *πόλιν θεμελίους ἔχουσαν* in v. 10 above. That this *πατρὶς* was not of an *earthly* nature, the writer proceeds to shew.

15. *Καὶ εἰ μὲν ἐκείνης ἀνακάμψαι, for had they cherished the memory of that* [country] *from which they came, they had opportunity of returning* [thither]. That is, if their native country on earth (*πατρὶς*), had been an object of affectionate desire, they might have easily returned thither, and dwelt there. But this they did not; for,

16. *Νῦν δὲ ὀρέγονται ἐπουρανίου, but now, they were desirous of a better* [country], *that is, of a heavenly one. Νῦν*, i. e. while they were strangers and sojourners, during the time *then present.* The explanation of the writer, in respect to the country which the patriarchs sought, is so plain, that nothing can add to its perspicuity.

Διὸ οὐκ ἐπαισχύνεται πόλιν, wherefore God is not ashamed of them, [nor] *to be called their God; for he hath prepared a city for them. Διό, because*, viz. because of the faith which they reposed in the promises of God respecting future happiness, or in regard to a *πόλιν ἐπουράνιον* or *μένουσαν. To be their God* means, to be their protector, rewarder, benefactor; comp. Rom. 3: 29. Rev. 21: 3, 7. Ex. 3: 6. Zech. 8: 8. Gen. 15: 1. *Ἡτοίμασε γὰρ αὐτοῖς πόλιν*, i. e. he will reward them, for he has in fact pre-

pared a πόλιν, sc. ἑπουράνιον, for them. By ellipsis οὐκ ἐπαισχύνεται is omitted before θεὸς ἐπικαλεῖσθαι αὐτῶν.

17. *Πίστει προσενήνοχεν πειραζόμενος, by faith, Abraham, when tried, made an offering of Isaac.* Προσενήνοχε, *made an offering of*; for the act, on the part of Abraham, was *essentially* done, when he had fully resolved to do it, and was proceeding to the complete execution of it, Gen. 22: 1—10. Πειραζόμενος (like the Hebrew נָסָה) means, either *to put to trial*, or *to tempt*, i. e. solicit to sin. Which of these senses the word must bear, in any particular passage, must depend on the character of the agent who occasions the trial or temptation, and the objects which he has in view. Beyond all question, נָסָה in Gen. 22: 1, and πειραζόμενος in our verse, are to be understood in the sense of *trial*; for *God* is the agent, and "he tempts no man," i. e. solicits none to sin, James 1: 13.

Καὶ τὸν μονογενῆ ἀναδεξάμενος, yea, he who had received the promises, made an offering of his only Son. Gen. 22: 2. This clause is designed to augment the force of the description of Abraham's case. It was not simply, that Abraham, in circumstances common to others, i. e. surrounded by several children, and without any special promises, made the offering in question; but it was Abraham, to whom God had repeatedly made promises of a numerous progeny; and it was Abraham's *only son*, i. e. only son of promise, who was the offering which he stood ready to make.

18. *Πρὸς ὃν σπέρμα, unto whom it had been said, After Isaac shall thy seed be named.* The Hebrew, in Gen. 21: 12, is כִּי בְיִצְחָק יִקָּרֵא לְךָ זָרַע׃, which means, *thy seed shall be named after Isaac*, i. e. thy seed, viz. the seed which is *promised* to thee, must descend only from Isaac. Neither Ishmael, nor the sons of Abraham by Keturah, could be progenitors of the *promised* offspring, and give name to them. The Septuagint and apostle have rendered the Hebrew preposition ב, in בְיִצְחָק, by ἐν, which there means, *according to, with reference to, after*. This is a third circumstance added, in order to augment the impression of the reader respecting the faith of Abraham. This patriarch, to whom promises had been made, not only offered up his only son, born of Sarah his beloved wife, but his only son, on whom all the promises of God respecting his future progeny were suspended.

19. *Λογισάμενος, ὅτι καὶ θεὸς, counting that God was*

able to raise him even from the dead; i. e. he believed, that, in case Isaac should be actually slain and consumed as a burnt-offering, God could and would raise him up from the dead, so that the promise made to him would be fulfilled. This was indeed a signal example of the strength of faith, and it deserves the commendation which the apostle bestows upon it.

There are not wanting, however, critics of the present time, who attribute this whole transaction of Abraham to his superstition, or his heathenish views of sacrifice, or to a dream which he erroneously considered as a divine admonition. And in regard to the interposition from heaven, which prevented his resolution from being executed, they aver, that the accidental discovery of a ram, caught by the horns in a thicket, was interpreted by the superstitious patriarch, as a divine admonition to refrain from proceeding with his design. How different all this is, from the views of the author who wrote Gen. XXII., of Paul in Rom. IV., and of the writer of our epistle, need not be insisted on to any one, who does not make his own conceptions about the subject of religion and miracles, the standard by which the sacred writers are to be tried.

Ὅθεν αὐτὸν ἐκομίσατο, whence, comparatively, he obtained him, or, *whence, as it were, he obtained him.* It would occupy much room even to glance at the variety of interpretations, which have been put on this somewhat difficult phrase. Instead of this, I will simply state the one which appears to me altogether the most probable and satisfactory. Paul, speaking of the procreation of Isaac, in Rom. IV., mentions Abraham as then *νενεκρωμένον*, and the *νέκρωσιν τῆς μήτρας* of Sarah. In v. 12 above, the same apostle speaks of Abraham as *νενεκρωμένον*, and his description of Sarah, in v. 11, implies the same thing. Now as Isaac sprang from Abraham and Sarah, both *κατὰ ταῦτα νενεκρωμένοι*, what is more natural than to suppose, that in our verse this fact is adverted to? The sentiment seems to be this; 'Abraham believed that God could raise Isaac from the dead, because he had, as it were, obtained him from the dead, i. e. he was born of those who *κατὰ ταῦτα νεκροὶ ἦσαν.*) Then the whole presents one consistent and apposite sentiment. Abraham believed God could raise his son from the dead. Why? He had good reason to conclude so, for God had already done *what was equivalent to this,* or *like this;* he had done this, *ἐν παραβολῇ, in a comparative manner,* i. e. in a manner

that would compare with raising from the dead, when he brought about his birth from those who were dead as to the power of procreation. *Παραβολὴ* means, *comparison, similitude; ἐν παραβολῇ, comparatively, in like manner, with similitude, as it were.* Thus all is easy, natural, and consistent. How forced the other methods of construction are, which have been employed here, the reader may determine for himself, by consulting them.

It may be made a question, whether *ἐκομίσατο* refers here, to Abraham's having *obtained* Isaac from the altar of burnt offering, where he was as it were dead; or whether the word refers to Abraham's having *originally obtained* him, viz. at his birth. It may be applied to either; but the latter application is far more significant, and accords altogether with the context. The hints for this explanation I owe to Dr. Schulz, in his commentary on the epistle to the Hebrews.

20. *Πίστει περὶ μελλόντων Ἡσαῦ, by faith Isaac blessed Jacob and Esau, in respect to the future. Περὶ μελλόντων εὐλόγησε,* lit. *blessed Jacob and Esau in regard to future things.* The sentiment is, 'pronounced a blessing upon Jacob and Esau, in regard to their future condition;' which accords with the facts as related in Gen. 27: 26—40. It was faith in the promises of God, which enabled the dying patriarch to do this.

21. *Πίστει Ἰακὼβ εὐλόγησε, by faith, Jacob, when about to die, blessed each of Joseph's sons.* See Gen. 48: 15, 16. *Ἀποθνήσκων* here, like the present participle in Hebrew, has the meaning of the Latin future in *rus.* It was not in the act of dying, that Jacob blessed the sons of Joseph, as Gen. 48: 8—22 shews; but it was when on his death bed, that both they and the twelve sons of Jacob were blessed by him; see Gen. 47: 31. 48: 2. 49: 33.

Καὶ προσεκύνησεν αὐτοῦ, and bowed himself upon the top of his staff. This last action did not accompany the blessing of the sons of Joseph; at least it is not related in connexion with it, but as preceding it. See Gen. 47: 31, comp. 48: 1, 15, 16. I regard it, therefore, as a *separate* transaction. *Προσεκύνησε* (Hebrew וַיִּשְׁתַּחוּ) designates, as it would seem, *the act of worship* or *reverence*, paid to God, and occasioned by the grateful emotions of the dying patriarch, on account of the promise which his son Joseph had just made, to bury him with his fathers. That the Hebrew וַיִּשְׁתַּחוּ, and the corresponding Greek *προσεκύνησε*, are some-

times employed simply and merely to designate an act of religious worship, is plain from 2 K. 5: 18. Gen. 23: 5. 1 Sam. 1: 3. That הִשְׁתַּחֲוָה generally means, *worship or reverence by bowing down toward the earth*, or even *to the earth*, is sufficiently plain; but that, in some cases, it also designates *worship* simply as a religious act, without necessarily implying a particular position of body, is sufficiently plain from 1 K. 1: 47, where it is said of David, in extreme old age, and confined to his bed, וַיִּשְׁתַּחוּ הַמֶּלֶךְ עַל־הַמִּשְׁכָּב, *he worshipped upon his bed;* a phrase constructed exactly like that in Gen. 47: 31; in both of which cases, Gesenius says, the act of worship is signified without bowing down. This is indeed clear, from the nature of the position, and the infirmities of Jacob and David. If the reader wants evidence of a similar meaning of *προσκυνέω*, he may consult John 4: 20—24. 12: 20. Acts 8: 27. 24: 11, etc.

The only question of difficulty that remains, is, whether the present vowel-pointing of the Hebrew, עַל רֹאשׁ הַמִּטָּה, *upon the head of the bed*, is probably more correct than the Septuagint mode of reading the Hebrew, viz. עַל רֹאשׁ הַמַּטֶּה, *upon the top of his staff*. I have no hesitation in preferring the latter punctuation; for what is רֹאשׁ הַמִּטָּה, *the head of a bed*, in the oriental country, when the bed itself is nothing more than a piece of soft carpeting thrown down upon the floor? And what can be the meaning of Jacob's *bowing himself upon the head of the bed?* For (1), there is no evidence, that Jacob was upon the bed, when Joseph paid him the visit recorded in Gen. 47: 28—31. It was *after* this, that Jacob was taken sick, Gen. 48: 1, and sat up on his bed, when Joseph came to visit him; 48: 2. (2) An infirm person, lying upon a bed, if he assumed a position such as to *bow himself*, would sit on the *middle* of the bed, and *not* upon the *head* of it. (3) In all the Scriptures, the *head of a bed* is not once mentioned; and for a good reason, as the oriental bed had, strictly speaking, no head. For these reasons, I must regard Jacob as leaning upon *the top of his staff* for support, when he conversed with his son Joseph; than which nothing can be more natural, for a person of his very advanced years. In this position he was, when Joseph sware to him, that he would comply with the request which he had made in respect to his burial. This was so grateful to his feelings, that he spontaneously offered up his thanks to God for such a favour, q. d. *he worshipped upon the top of his staff*, i. e. leaning upon the top of

his staff, he offered homage or thanks to God; just as David "worshipped upon his bed," i. e. did homage, or paid reverence to God, while on his bed, 1 K. 1: 47.

That the *present* vowel-points of the Hebrew do not, in *every* case, give the most probable sense of the original, will not appear strange to any one, who reflects that they were introduced *after* the fifth century of our present era. All enlightened critics, of the present day, disclaim the idea that they are *authoritative*.

The apostle says, that *by faith* Jacob worshipped. I understand this of that confidence in God which he entertained, and which led him to trust, that all which Joseph had promised him would be accomplished.

22. *Πίστει Ἰωσὴφ ἐνετείλατο, by faith Joseph, at the close of life, made mention of the departure of the children of Israel* [from Egypt], *and gave commandment respecting his own bones.* See Gen. 50: 24—26. Josh. 24: 32. *Τελευτῶν*, see on *ἀποθνήσκων* in v. 21. *Ἐνετείλατο*, i. e. he commanded that his bones should be carried up, out of Egypt, to the land of Canaan, when the Israelites removed thither. It was by faith in the promises of God, that Joseph spoke thus confidently respecting the future exodus of the Israelites, and gave directions respecting his bones, which could be executed only in case this exodus took place.

23. *Πίστει Μωϋσῆς αὐτοῦ, by faith Moses, after his birth, was concealed for three months by his parents.* See Ex. 2: 2. What is attributed by our author to the *parents* of Moses, is there said to have been done by his mother. But doubtless it was with her husband's knowledge and concurrence; and even if it were not, there are many cases in Scripture, where what is done by one of any class or company of men, is attributed generally to the class or company; e. g. one evangelist says that the *thieves* on the cross reviled Jesus; but another informs us that *one of them* did this. That *πατέρες* applies to both father and mother is well known, it being equivalent to our word *parents*.

Διότι εἶδον βασιλέως, because they saw that he was a goodly child, and did not fear the king's commandment. *Ἀστεῖον*, Heb. טוֹב, *goodly, fair, beautiful.* *Διάταγμα τοῦ βασιλέως*, viz. the command of Pharaoh, to destroy all the male children, Ex. 1: 16, 22. It was faith or confidence in divine protection, which led them to perform such a hazardous duty.

24. *Πίστει Μοϋσῆς Φαραώ, by faith Moses, when arrived at mature age, refused to be called the son of Pharaoh's daughter. Μέγας γενόμενος* means, *become full grown, become adult, having attained the stature of a man.* *Ἠρνήσατο, refused,* etc.; no express act of this kind is related in the sacred history; but the whole account of Moses' conduct shews that he had, at this period, fully resolved upon leaving the court of Pharaoh, and embarking in the cause of the oppressed Israelites.

25. *Μᾶλλον ἑλόμενος ἀπόλαυσιν, choosing rather to suffer affliction with the people of God, than to enjoy the pleasures of sin for a season. Λαῷ τοῦ θεοῦ,* i. e. the Israelites, to whom this name is often given. *Πρόσκαιρον ἁμαρτίας ἀπόλαυσιν,* viz. the pleasures of living at the court of Pharaoh, in princely magnificence.

26. *Μείζονα πλοῦτον Χριστοῦ, counting reproach, like that which Christ suffered, as greater riches than all the treasures of Egypt.* That *ὀνειδισμὸν τοῦ Χριστοῦ* has the meaning here assigned to it, seems quite evident, if we consider, that the comparison between the reproach which Christ himself suffered, and the treasures of Egypt, would be inapposite here. The simple sentiment is, 'Moses renounced pleasure and wealth, and endured suffering and reproach, because he believed in the promises which God had made of future good, and that he would deliver his people from the bondage of Egypt. So Christ, "though rich, for our sakes became poor," in order to redeem us from a bondage worse than that of Egypt. That Moses, then, counted *reproach like that which Christ suffered,* as preferable to the pleasure and wealth which he might have enjoyed at the Egyptian court, is plainly the meaning of the writer. Compare *παθήματα Χριστοῦ, sufferings like those of Christ,* in 2 Cor. 1: 5. Such a use of the genitive case is by no means unfrequent.

Ἀπέβλεπε γὰρ εἰς τὴν μισθαποδοσίαν, because he had respect to the retribution. *Ἀπέβλεπε* means, *to look away from* present things, and *to have respect to,* or *look forward to,* future ones. The *retribution* of the invisible world is doubtless meant, here, by *μισθαποδοσίαν.* Compare vs. 13—16, and v. 27. By faith in the proffered happiness of a future state, Moses was led to the acts of self denial here adverted to.

27. *Πίστει κατέλιπεν βασιλέως, by faith he left Egypt, not fearing the indignation of the king.* It has been dis-

puted, whether it was the *first* or *second* time that Moses left Egypt, to which the writer here adverts. The *first* is related in Ex. II., and was when he fled to Jethro in Midian. But as he fled, in this case, to save his life, which Pharaoh sought to destroy, Ex. 2: 14, 15, this cannot be the leaving Egypt to which the apostle refers; although Chrysostom, Theodoret, Theophylact, Oecumenius, and some of the modern critics, have understood it to be so. It must be the occurrences related in Ex. X—XIV., to which our author refers. *Τὸν θυμὸν τοῦ βασιλέως*, see Ex. 10: 28, 29.

Τὸν γὰρ ἀόρατον ὡς ὁρῶν ἐκαρτέρησε, for he persevered, as one who sees him that is invisible. *Ἐκαρτέρησε, perduravit, fortiter* vel *patienter duravit*, if it relate to perseverance in a time of trial and suffering, as here. It does not of itself indicate endurance of suffering, but *holding out, persevering*, in any state or condition, *keeping up good courage and fortitude perseveringly* or *constantly.* *Ἀόρατον*, i. e. him whom "no eye hath seen," viz. the invisible God; an appellation frequently given to the Deity; e. g. 1 Tim. 1: 17. comp. Rom. 1: 20. Col. 1: 15, 16. In other words, a regard to that world, which is seen only by the eye of faith, led Moses to quit Egypt, in defiance of Pharaoh's injunctions.

28. *Πίστει πεποίηκε αὐτῶν, by faith, he observed the passover, and the sprinkling of the blood, so that he who destroyed the first born might not touch them.* *Πεποίηκε τὸ πάσχα*, Hebrew עָשָׂה פֶּסַח, which the Seventy translate *ποιεῖν τὸ πάσχα*. This means, (as we say), *to keep* or *celebrate the passover.* The Hebrew פֶּסַח comes from פָּסַח, *to pass over, to pass by.* The Greek form *πάσχα* comes from the Aramaean Hebrew word, פַּסְחָא, which was the Jewish method of pronouncing פֶּסַח in later times, and to which the Greek word exactly corresponds. The account of the event to which the word *πάσχα* relates, may be seen in Ex. XII.; for the etymology, see vs. 11, 13. *Ὁ ὀλοθρεύων τὰ πρωτότοκα*, see Ex. 12: 12. *Μὴ θίγῃ αὐτῶν*, Ex. 12: 13; *αὐτῶν*, in the genitive, is governed by *θίγῃ*, as verbs of sense (touch) govern the genitive.

All this was done *by faith*, i. e. because Moses fully believed, that what God had foretold would come to pass; in other words, it was through confidence in the divine declarations.

29. *Πίστει διέβησαν ξηρᾶς, by faith, they passed through the Red Sea, as on dry land.* The nominative to *διέβησαν* is *οἱ Ἰσραηλῖται*, which the writer leaves his readers to supply from the

tenor of the narration. Instances of the like kind are not unfrequent, both in the writings of the Old Testament and of the New. See the history of the event, in Ex. xiv.

Ἧς πεῖραν κατεπόθησαν, which the Egyptians assaying to do, were drowned. *Ἧς πεῖραν λαβόντες* is an expression of peculiar construction. *Ἧς πεῖραν* means *the attempt of which*, viz. of passing through the Red sea; so that *ἧς πεῖραν λαβόντες* is equivalent to, *ἧς διάβασιν πειράζοντες, attempting the passage of which.* *Κατεπόθησαν* from *καταπίνω, to swallow up, to engulf, to overwhelm*, and hence, *to drown.* See Ex. 14: 27, 28.

It was on account of confidence in the promise of God, to bring the Israelites safely through the Red sea, that they ventured to cross an arm of it, looking to him for protection from its waters. It is not to be supposed, that every individual of the Israelites possessed such a confidence as is here described; but their leaders had it, and (as in other cases of a similar nature) it is predicated of the nation.

30. *Πίστει τὰ τείχη ἡμέρας, by faith, the walls of Jericho fell down, after they had been compassed about, for seven days.* See Josh. 6: 12—20. It was in consequence of the promise made by God to Joshua, that Jericho should be taken, after the Israelites had marched around it for seven days in succession, that these circuits were performed. It was *confidence*, then, in the divine word, which led to the event in question. *Κυκλωθέντα*, Rosenmueller, Schleusner, Dindorf, and others, understand to have respect to *circumvallation*, or a siege of the city by surrounding it; altogether contrary to the meaning of the narration in Joshua vi. For what can be the meaning of Josh. 6: 15, on the supposition that their interpretation is correct? Did the Israelites lay *seven sieges* to it, in one day? Most evident is it, that the sacred writer considers the whole event of the taking of Jericho as *miraculous;* and all attempts to explain it away by supposing a regular *circumvallation*, and that the city was stormed by the troops of Joshua, on the seventh day, are glosses forced upon the Scripture by the sceptical philosophy of interpreters; not a simple explanation of the meaning of the sacred writers.

31. *Πίστει Ῥαὰβ εἰρήνης, by faith, Rahab the harlot, having entertained the spies in a friendly manner, perished not with the unbelieving.* *Οὐ συναπώλετο*, i. e. was preserved, the affirma-

tive idea being conveyed (as often elsewhere) by the use of a negative form of expression 'Απειθήσασι refers to the inhabitants of Canaan, who treated the claims of the Israelites to that country with *contumacy*, and disbelieved what Jehovah had said respecting them. 'Απειθής is *one who refuses to be persuaded, who is contumacious.* The event to which this clause relates, is narrated in Josh. 6: 22—25.

Δεξαμένη, *having entertained, received,* viz. into her house. Μετ' εἰρήνης, *with amity, in a peaceable manner;* like the Hebrew שָׁלוֹם, *friendship,* e. g. Ps. 41: 10. Jer. 20: 10. 38: 22. Obed. 7. Ps. 28: 3, comp. Est. 9: 30.

It has been doubted whether πόρνη, the appellation given to Rahab, here and in James 2: 25, means *harlot,* or *hostess.* For the latter, Schleusner contends, in his Lexicon; as do also many commentators. The corresponding Hebrew word is זוֹנָה, which they say comes from זוּן *pascere, alere,* so that זוֹנָה may well be explained merely as *one who furnishes others with nutriment,* i. e. a hostess. But this derivation is contrary to the laws of etymology; for זוֹנָה must come from זָנָה, *to commit whoredom,* and not from זוּן, *to feed;* so that the whole argument, on which this interpretation is built, falls to the ground. Besides, the *usus loquendi* both of זוֹנָה and πόρνη, is against such an interpretation.

32. Καὶ τί ἔτι λέγω; *and what shall I say more?* or, *why should I recount examples any longer?*

'Επιλείψει γάρ με προφητῶν, *for time would fail me, should I tell of Gideon, and Barak, and Sampson, and Jephtha, of David and Samuel, and the prophets.* The history of these, see in the books of Judges and Samuel.

33. Οἱ διὰ πίστεως βασιλείας, *who, through faith, subdued kingdoms.* That is, confidence in divine promises respecting the deliverance of Israel, led them to war with and subdue the kingdoms of those, who oppressed the Hebrew nation.

Εἰργάσαντο δικαιοσύνην, Hebrew עָשׂוּ צֶדֶק, or, פָּעֲלוּ צֶדֶק, *practised justice, did that which was equitable and proper, carried the laws of justice into execution,* which latter seems to be the idea here.

'Επέτυχον ἐπαγγελίας, *obtained promised blessings,* i. e. as the reward of their confidence in God. 'Επαγγελίας means here, as generally in this epistle, *quod promissum est;* and refers to the va-

rious successes which, at different times, attended the obedient efforts and deeds of kings and prophets.

Ἔφραξαν στόματα λεόντων, which probably refers to the history of Sampson, Judg. 14: 5—9; of David, 1 Sam. 17: 34—36; and of Daniel, Dan. 6: 16—24.

34. *Ἔσβεσαν δύναμιν πυρός, they quenched the violence of fire.* See in Dan. 3: 19—26.

Ἔφυγον στόματα μαχαίρας, they escaped the edge of the sword. Στόματα μαχαίρας, Hebrew פִּי־חָרֶב. The expression is frequent in Hebrew, and the equivalent one, *στόμα μαχαίρας*, is several times used in the New Testament. The phrase is of a *general* nature, and is therefore applicable to many cases in the Old Testament, where escape from imminent danger is related.

Ἐνεδυναμώθησαν ἀπὸ ἀσθενείας, were restored to vigour from a state of infirmity. *Ἀσθένεια* refers to the infirmity occasioned by sickness, or disease; not to the weakness of one army compared with another, or of one man compared with another. The case of Sampson, then, in Judg. 15: 15, 19. 16: 19 seq. to which Dr. Schulz refers us, seems not to be such as the writer had in view; but rather such cases as that of Hezekiah, 2 K. xx.

Ἐγενήθησαν ἰσχυροὶ ἐν πολέμῳ, became mighty in war. Cases of this nature, the books of Joshua, Judges, Samuel, Kings, and Chronicles, supply in abundance.

Παρεμβολὰς ἔκλιναν ἀλλοτρίων, overthrew the armies of foreigners. Many cases of this nature are presented in the same books. *Παρεμβολάς* means, *camps, encampments;* hence, *the persons who live in them*, i. e. armies. *Ἀλλοτρίων*, נֵכָר, זָר, i. e. strangers to the Hebrews, and to the worship of the true God; hence, *foreigners, heathen.*

35. *Ἔλαβον νεκροὺς αὐτῶν, women recovered their dead, by a resurrection.* *Ἐξ ἀναστάσεως* designates *restoration to life from a state of death, a renewed subsistence or existence, a resurrection;* which corresponds with facts, as related in Scripture; e. g. 2 K. 4: 18—37. 1 K. 17: 17—24. *Τοὺς νεκροὺς αὐτῶν*, viz, *their dead children;* which is implied by *αὐτῶν*.

Ἄλλοι δὲ ἐτυμπανίσθησαν, some were tortured and beaten. Τυμπανίζω, to tympanize, means to stretch upon an instrument called *τύμπανον*, (the shape of which is not certainly known, at present), for the sake of giving the body an attitude of peculiar ex-

posure to the power of cudgels or rods. It involves the idea of scourging or beating in this peculiar way; i. e. torture by stretching upon the *τύμπανον*, and beating, were conjoined at the same time.

Οὐ προσδεξάμενοι τύχωσιν, not accepting liberation, in order that they might obtain a better resurrection. That is, they declined accepting liberation from their torments, on condition of renouncing their religion. They looked to a resurrection of the body, which was of a higher nature than merely the redeeming it, for a while, from temporal death; and in view of this, they refused to accept of liberation from their torments, on the condition prescribed. They persevered, because their faith enabled them to regard as a certainty, the future and glorious resurrection of the just.

Κρείττονος ἀναστάσεως, better resurrection. Better than what? Plainly, better than that which had just been mentioned, viz. resurrection to life in the present world merely; as in the examples of the children, mentioned in 1 K. xvii. and 2 K. iv. It was not the hope of such a resurrection—the hope of merely regaining the present life, and being again subject to death, as before—which led the martyrs, suffering upon the *τύμπανον*, to refuse liberation. It was the hope of resurrection to a life of immortal happiness and glory, that led them to refuse liberation.

36. *Ἕτεροι δὲ ἔλαβον, others were tried by mockings and scourges,* lit. others were put to the trial of mockings and scourges. *Ἐμπαιγμῶν* refers to scorn, derision, and buffeting, which the victims of persecution experienced. *Μαστίγων* designates a method of scourging, different from that practised by the use of the *τύμπανον*. See 2 Macc. 7: 1. 2 K. 2: 23. 1 K. 22: 24.

Ἔτι δὲ δεσμῶν καὶ φυλακῆς, and also by bonds and imprisonment. See 1 K. 22: 27. Jer. xx.

37. *Ἐλιθάσθησαν ἀπέθανον, they were stoned, they were sawn asunder, they were tempted, they perished by the murderous sword.* The instances, mentioned in this verse, of suffering and death, are not distinctly recorded in the Old Testament; but were doubtless all of them realities, and often repeated, under the terrible persecution of Antiochus Epiphanes, and perhaps of Manasseh, and others. The Jews have had a tradition, from time immemorial, that Isaiah was sawn asunder by the command of Manasseh.

The word *ἐπειράσθησαν* has been a stumbling block to the great body of critics, both in ancient and modern times. The difficulty lies in the fact, that a word of a mere *generic* signification, and of a milder aspect, should be inserted in the midst of those, which designate *specific* sufferings, and those of a high degree. Accordingly, it has been proposed to read, *ἐπυράσθησαν, ἐπηρώθησαν, ἐπρήσθησαν, ἐπάρθησαν, ἐπυρώθησαν, ἐπράθησαν, ἐσπειράσθησαν, ἐσθαιρίσθησαν, ἐπηρεάσθησαν, ἐταριχεύθησαν*, or *ἐπειράθησαν*; all of which are without any authority, while *ἐπειράσθησαν* is well supported. In such a case, conjecture, moreover, is out of question, so long as the established reading will make any tolerable sense. In respect to the contested word, *ἐπειράσθησαν*, it seems to me that the great body of critics have overlooked a very obvious and intensive meaning of it, viz. that of *temptation to do evil*; which in the case presented by v. 37 here, must mean, 'temptations presented by persecutors to the victims of their torture, in order to induce them to forsake their religion, and worship the gods of idolaters.' Such was a common practice among the heathen persecutors of Christians. Not only life, but wealth and honour were frequently proffered, in the midst of torture most agonizing to the human frame, in order to tempt the martyrs to forsake their religion. Such a temptation as this, is by no means to be reckoned, under such circumstances, among the *lighter* trials of good men; and to such an one, it is plain our text may refer. Is it not probable, that it has such a reference? Compare the latter part of v. 35. If so, this *locus vexatissimus* may be permitted to rest in quiet, not only as being supported by good authority, but as altogether significant, and entirely consonant with the writer's purpose.

Περιῆλθον ἐν κακουχούμενοι, they went about in sheepskins and goat skins, suffering want, afflicted, injuriously treated. That is, driven out from the society of men, they were obliged to clothe themselves with the skins of animals; to undergo all the wants and distresses to which such a condition reduced them; and to submit to the injuries, which were heaped upon them by their persecutors.

38. *Ὧν οὐκ ἦν ἄξιος ὁ κόσμος, of whom the world was not worthy*, i. e. with whom the world could not bear a comparison in respect to worth; in other words, 'who were of a character elevated

far above that of the rest of the world.' This is a *proverbial* expression, and plainly is to be included here in a parenthesis, as it is an ejaculation of the writer, interrupting the regular series of the discourse.

Ἐν ἐρημίαις γῆς, wandering around in deserts and mountains, in caves also and dens of the earth. A further description of persons banished from society, and wandering hither and thither, in order to find the means of subsistence, or to avoid the rage of persecution. *Σπηλαίοις* and *ὀπαῖς* include fissures of the rocks, and holes in the earth; both of which were resorted to by these outcasts, for a shelter, when one was needed.

39. *Καὶ οὗτοι πάντες ἐπαγγελίαν, all these, moreover, who are commended on account of faith, obtained not the promised blessing.* That is, they lived in expectation of some *future* good, of some promised blessing. They habitually, by faith, looked forward to something which they did not attain, in the present life. *Μαρτυρηθέντες, commended;* as often before, in this epistle.

40. *Τοῦ θεοῦ περὶ τελειωθῶσι, God having provided some better thing for us, so that without us they could not fully obtain what was needed.* An exceedingly difficult verse, about the meaning of which there have been a multitude of conjectures. The only ones that deserve particular regard are, that the *κρεῖττόν τι* refers to the Messiah; or, that it refers to the happiness of the heavenly world. In the latter sense, some very respectable interpreters take it. But how is *heavenly blessedness* vouchsafed to later more than to ancient saints? And in what sense can it be affirmed, that the ancients could not, or did not, attain it without us? The object of the writer, through the chapter, has been to shew that the hopes of heaven, cherished by the ancient worthies, were firm and bright, through faith in the word of God. That they did, at last, actually attain the object of their hopes, surely will not be doubted. The "better thing reserved for Christians," then, is not a reward in heaven; for such a reward was proffered also to the ancient saints.

I must therefore adopt another exegesis of the whole passage; which refers *ἐπαγγελίαν* to the promised blessing of the Messiah. See Gen. 12: 1—3. 17: 1—8. I construe the whole passage, then, in this manner. 'The ancient worthies persevered in their faith, although the Messiah was known to them only by *promise*. We

are under greater obligations than they to persevere; for God has fulfilled his promise respecting the Messiah, and thus placed us in a condition better adapted to perseverance than theirs. So much is our condition preferable to theirs, that we may even say, Without the blessing which we enjoy, their happiness could not be completed.' In other words, The coming of the Messiah was essential to the consummation of their happiness in glory, i. e. was necessary to their τελείωσις.

In 9: 15, (comp. 9: 26 and Rom. 3: 25, 26), the death of Christ is represented as having a *retrospective* influence upon past ages. The happiness, then, of the ancient worthies, is connected with Christ's coming and atonement. And to these the writer seems to me to advert, when he says μὴ χωρὶς ἡμῶν τελειωθῶσι, i. e. without what has taken place in our days, their happiness could not be perfected, great and good as they were. If this be not his meaning, I am unable to discover it. And this meaning is altogether apposite to his purpose; for, as he had shewn that *faith* was the means, to the ancient worthies, of perseverance and of obtaining future happiness, even *before* the coming of the Messiah, he might well argue, that *since* his coming, there were more powerful motives to persevere in the faith which he had been commending. If the ancients did so, whose happiness was connected with something then future, and which was to happen only in later days, then surely Christians ought now to persevere, who have actually witnessed the performance of promised good, for which the ancients only hoped. The κρεῖττόν τι, then, seems to be, 'the actual fulfilment of the promise respecting the Messiah;' in respect to which, later times certainly have a pre-eminence over the early ones; and on which, the expected happiness of early times was really dependent.

CHAP. XII.

1. *Τοιγαροῦν καὶ μαρτύρων, since now we are encompassed by so great a multitude of witnesses;* i. e. by so great a multitude of spectators. An allusion, as the sequel shews, is here made to the stadium of the Greeks and Romans, where the persons stood, who were to engage in the exercises of their public games, sur-

rounded by great multitudes of spectators. In a condition resembling this, the writer now places the Hebrew Christians whom he is addressing, and surrounds them with the multitude of worthies and martyrs, to whom he had been alluding, in the preceding chapters. *Νέφος* is figuratively used for *multitude*. So the heathen writers also; e. g. Herod. VIII. 109, *νέφος τοσοῦτο ἀνθρώπων*. Eurip. Phoeniss. 1321, *νέφος πολεμίων*. Hec. 907, *τοιόνδε Ἑλλήνων νέφος*, where the Scholiast explains *νέφος* by *πλῆθος*. Aristoph. Avib. *στρουθιῶν νέφος*. Hom. Il. ψ. 133, *νέφος πεζῶν*. Diod. Sic. III. 28, *νεφέλη* [i. q. *νέφος*] *ἀνρίδων*.

The writer proceeds to exhort the combatants to prepare for the contest before them. *Ὄγκον ἀποθέμενοι πάντα, laying aside every incumbrance.* *Ὄγκος* means *swelling, tumour, pride*; also, *weight, weightiness*. The reference here is, to those who ran in stadium, and who laid aside all superfluous clothing, and disincumbered themselves of every thing which could impede their progress. The simple word, *weight*, would not be of sufficient latitude to convey all which *ὄγκος* means, in the passage before us. Every *impediment* or hindrance is to be laid aside, or, every *incumbrance* is to be avoided.

Καὶ τὴν εὐπερίστατον ἁμαρτίαν, especially the sin which easily besets us. *Καί* I understand here, as a particle of connexion before the phrase *τὴν εὐπερίστατον ἁμαρτίαν*, and that it signifies *even, truly*, and is adequate, in such a connexion, to the English word *specially*, or, *in particular*. *Εὐπερίστατον* is a *ἅπαξ λεγόμενον*, the meaning of which has been variously explained. It is, in its composition, analogical with *εὐπερίγραφος, εὐπερίπατος, εὐπερίχυτος*, etc. *Περιΐστημι* means, *to stand round, surround*. Hence Chrysostom explains *εὐπερίστατον* by *ἡ εὐκόλως περιϊσταμένη ἡμᾶς, which easily comes* or *stands around us*. So, many modern interpreters understand the word; which, on the whole, seems to me most apposite. The *ἁμαρτία* which most easily beset the Hebrews, was undoubtedly *apostasy*, or defection from their Christian profession; against which the whole epistle is directed. They were under peculiar temptations to this sin, in consequence of the persecutions which they endured, and their former prejudices in favour of Judaism.

But other critics, ancient and modern, explain *εὐπερίστατον* in a somewhat different manner. *Περίστασις*, among other things,

denotes, as Hesychius affirms, *θλίψις, ἀνάγκη, μέριμνα.* Hence Theodoret explains *εὐπερίστατον*, by *δι' ἣν εὐκόλως τις εἰς περιστάσεις ἐμπίπτει, by which any one easily falls into troubles* or *afflictions.* That is, 'Lay aside the sin, which will easily bring you into a state of punishment or distress.' So some of the modern critics, also, explain the word; especially as the Greek *ἀπερίστατον* means, *not dangerous, free from vexation.* Hence, they conclude, *εὐπερίστατον* must mean the opposite of this, viz. *full of danger* or *trouble; εὖ* being intensive, as in *εὐμεγέθης, εὐμήκης*, etc. This is a very good sense, and well supported by analogy. It may therefore be safely admitted.

Others, Ernesti, Doederlein, et al. prefer to render *εὐπερίστατος* by *quod patronos habet, quod homines favent;* i. e. *εὐπερίστατον* is, with them, *well surrounded*, viz. by applauding multitudes. But the preceding sense is better supported than this, by analogy.

Δι' ὑπομενῆς ἀγῶνα, let us run with perseverance the race set before us. Ὑπομενῆς refers, here, not so much to enduring patiently evils which might befal them, as to *holding out* in the race, *persevering* in their efforts, until it was completed, and the reward secured. Ἀγών means, *any kind of contest*, any gymnastic exercise which was a trial of skill, or in which there was a competition. Here, plainly, it is limited to designate *a race*, by the accompanying *τρέχωμεν. Προκείμαι* is employed, by the classical writers, in the same way as here, viz. to designate the proposal of this or that *ἀγών* to the *ἀγωνίσται.*

The simple meaning of the whole verse, divested of metaphor, is, 'Since so many illustrious patriarchs, prophets, and martyrs, who preceded us, have exercised faith, persevered in it, and obtained the rewards consequent upon it, let us, in like manner, rejecting every solicitation to renounce our hopes and our holy religion, persevere in the belief and in the duties which the gospel requires.'

2. That they may be excited to do this, he now refers them to the example of Christ himself. Ἀφορῶντες εἰς τὸν Ἰησοῦν, *looking to Jesus the author and perfecter of our faith.* Ἀρχηγόν, *author, leader;* here it means, 'Jesus, who introduced the new religion or the Christian faith, who first taught it, who led the way in it.' See on 2: 10. Τελειωτήν, *he who completed* the system of faith or religion, which he had introduced. So it is commonly explained. It may be asked, however, whether the meaning of τε-

λειωτήν be not substantially the same with τελειωθείς 5: 9, τελειῶσαι 2: 10, τετελεσαμένον 7: 28, comp. v. 26 of the same. If construed according to this analogy, the meaning of the phrase would be, 'Let us look, for an example, to Jesus the author of our religion, now advanced to a state of glory.' There is an objection, however to this, arising from the clause in the last part of the verse, which seems to present the same idea. It is hardly probable, that the writer has fallen into tautology.

That πίστις often signifies, *the Christian faith* or *religion*, hardly needs to be mentioned.

Ὃς ἀντὶ τῆς χαρᾶς, *who, on account of the joy that was set before him.* This χαρὰ προκειμένη, was exaltation to the right hand of God in the world above, and the glorious reign which was to follow; as the last part of the verse shews. *The joy that was set before him*, was given to him when he had finished his course.

Ὑπέμεινε σταυρὸν κεκάθηκε, *endured the cross, disregarding ignominy, and has sat down at the right hand of the throne of God.* Ἐν δεξιᾷ τε κ. τ. λ, see on 1: 3. Αἰσχυνή means, *the shame* which others might heap upon him, i. e. *ignominy, disgrace*, or, the ignominious punishment of the cross.

Sentiment; 'Do as Christ the author of our holy religion did. For the heavenly reward proposed, he, with patience and perseverance, endured every kind of indignity and suffering, and has, in consequence of it, received a glorious reward. Follow in his steps, and participate in his glory.'

3. Ἀναλογίσασθε ἀντιλογίαν, *consider, now, him who endured such opposition against himself from sinners.* Ἀναλογίσασθε means, *reflect on his example, take his case into consideration.* Ἁμαρτωλῶν refers here, to the persecuting Jews of the Saviour's time, who thus evil entreated Jesus. Ἀντιλογίαν, רִיב, מְרִיבָה, *opposition, rebellion, contest against, contumely. Contradiction* is a term too soft to reach the full meaning.

Ἵνα μὴ κάμητε ἐκλυόμενοι, *lest, becoming discouraged in your minds, ye grow weary.* Ἐκλύομαι means, *to become discouraged* or *despondent.* I join the participle ἐκλυόμενοι with ταῖς ψυχαῖς. So Wahl, on ἐκλύομαι. The verb ἐκλύω has the same signification, if the noun be omitted; e. g. v. 5.

Κάμνω means, *to become wearied, to be tired out.* The first step toward forsaking the Christian course, is, to become *disheart-*

ened in the pursuit of it. Next, follows *weariness* in pursuing that, from which we do not hope or expect any certain good. This leads, of course, to an abandonment of the pursuit.

4. *Οὔπω μέχρις . . . ἀνταγωνιζόμενοι, ye have not yet resisted unto blood, in your contest against sin.* The phrase, *ye have not yet resisted unto blood*, is not to be understood as representing the Hebrew Christians as making, or preparing to make, active and hostile resistance to their aggressors or persecutors. This is not the meaning of the writer. It was *figuratively* a contest, in which the Hebrews were engaged; just as in vs. 1—3, he had represented it as a race, *ἀγών*. It was a contest with trial, temptation, affliction; the result of being persecuted by the enemies of the Christian religion. But the struggle had not yet proceeded so far, that they were called to martyrdom, as others in ancient times had been. Many vexations had been suffered by them; but the shedding of their blood had not yet commenced.

This could hardly be said in respect to the churches at Jerusalem, without limitation, where James and Stephen had actually suffered martyrdom, and others had been severely treated. Still, it might be said of the generation of Christians then living there.

Πρὸς τὴν ἁμαρτίαν, a controverted phrase. I understand it, (simply in accordance with the nature of the context), as an *abstract* noun put for a *concrete*, i. e. *ἁμαρτία* for *ἁμαρτωλούς*; an *usus loquendi* very common in both the Old and New Testaments. *Ἁμαρτίαν*, if explained thus, means, *persecutors*, viz. those who inflicted injuries upon the Hebrew Christians; and probably these were their own countrymen or nation, i. e. the Jews.

5. *Καὶ ἐκλέλησθε διαλέγεται, and have ye forgotten the exhortation which is addressed to you, as to children?* Most interpreters render *καὶ ἐκλέλησθε* without interrogation, *and ye have forgotten, ye must needs have forgotten*, etc. It seems to me more congruous with the apostle's manner of address, in this hortatory part of his epistle, to render it, (as Ernesti has done), *interrogatively*. It loses nothing of its force, and gains in respect to the manner of address.

Τέκνον μου ἐλεγχόμενος, my son, do not slight the chastening of the Lord, nor be disheartened when reproved by him. Ὀλιγώρει, Hebrew בְּזֵה, *contemn, slight, despise, disregard. Παιδείας*, in the sense of the Hebrew מוּסָר, *chastening, rebuke*. Classic usage

employs *παιδεία* in the sense of *instruction, discipline.* Ἐκλύου, Hebrew תָּקֹץ from קוּץ, *fastidire*, also *metuere*, i. e. *μὴ ἐκλύου, be not timid, be not disheartened*, viz. as to going forward in your Christian course; forsake it not, because you experience trouble in pursuing it. The quotation is from Prov. 3: 11, 12, and in the words of the Septuagint.

6. "*Ον γὰρ ἀγαπᾷ προσδέχεται, for whom the Lord loveth, he chasteneth, and scourgeth every son whom he receiveth. Μαστιγοῖ δὲ κ. τ. λ.* is after the words of the Septuagint, Prov. 3: 12. The Hebrew, as now read, gives a somewhat different meaning. It is thus, וּכְאָב אֶת־בֵּן יְרָצֶה, *and as a father* [chastens] *the son whom he loves.* The Seventy appear to have read וְכָאֵב, participle of כָּאַב, or else כִּאֵב in Piel. But no example of a *transitive* sense of כָּאַב, in Kal, is to be found; it means only, *to be afflicted, to feel pain.* Of the Piel form of this verb, no instance is found in the Hebrew Scriptures. Still, the Seventy may have read וּכְאֵב, *and pain*, viz. יִקְרָה *shall overtake* the son, etc.; which gives the same sense (for substance) as *μαστιγοῖ υἱόν.* In whatever way they read the Hebrew, in order to make their version, as the version now is, and as the apostle has quoted it, it preserves the *spirit*, though not the *letter*, of the original Hebrew. That quotations are often made by the New Testament writers from the Old Testament, in a *general* way, *ad sensum* and not *ad literam*, I have had frequent occasion to remark before, in commenting on our epistle. No one, who attentively studies the New Testament, can doubt this.

7. *Εἰ παιδείαν ὁ θεός, if ye endure chastisement, God dealeth with you as children.* Ὑπομένετε has the sense here of *enduring, undergoing, suffering*; and not that of *supporting, bearing up under, persevering.* Προσφέρεται (mid. voice) means *tractare aliquem.* So the classical writers also employ it. See Schneider and Schleusner on the word.

Τίς γὰρ ἔστιν πατήρ; for what son is there, whom his father does not chasten? That is, How can ye expect, although ye are *children*, not to receive any chastisement?

8. *Εἰ δὲ χωρίς ἐστε υἱοί, but if ye are without chastisement, (of which all children are made partakers), then are ye spurious and not* [legitimate] *children.* Νόθοι means, *illegitimate* children. Υἱοί, which is here the antithesis, of course means,

legitimate offspring. The meaning is, 'If ye are not dealt with as all legitimate children are, it would follow, that ye are considered as not belonging to them.' That is, if ye receive no chastening, then God does not acknowledge you as his spiritual children.

The design of the writer, in thus applying this text of Scripture, is plain. He means to tell the Hebrews, that so far from being disheartened by their trials and afflictions, on account of their Christian profession, they ought to regard it as matter of encouragement, and as an evidence, that God is acknowledging by these their filial relation to him.

9. *Εἶτα τοὺς μὲν ἐντρεπόμεθα, furthermore, we have had fathers of our flesh, who have chastised us, and we have yielded them reverence. Τῆς σαρκὸς ἡμῶν πατέρας, fathers of our flesh,* i. e. of our natural bodies. The idea is, 'the fathers of our *physical* nature, in distinction from our *spiritual* one.'

Οὐ πολλῷ μᾶλλον ζήσομεν; shall we not much rather yield subjection to the Father of [our] *spirits, that we may live?* That is, when God chastens us, for our good, in order that he may promote our final happiness, when he has so important an end in view; shall we not bow to his will, with cheerful subjection? *Πατρὶ τῶν πνευμάτων,* an antithesis of *τῆς σαρκὸς ἡμῶν πατέρας,* and therefore, plainly, *ἡμῶν* is implied after *πνευμάτων.* Num. 16: 22, אֱלֹהֵי הָרוּחוֹת לְכָל בָּשָׂר, *the God of the spirits of all flesh,* is a parallel expression. *Ζήσομεν* has the sense here, as often elsewhere, of *being happy;* like the Latin *vivere,* in *dum vivimus vivamus.*

10. *Οἱ μὲν γὰρ ἐπαίδευον, they, indeed, chastened us for a little while, according to their own pleasure. Πρὸς ὀλίγας ἡμέρας,* i. e. during our childhood, our minority; which seems to me a much more natural sense, than to say with Heinrichs and Dindorf, "the fruit of their chastisement was only temporary." *Κατὰ τὸ δοκοῦν αὐτοῖς, according to their own pleasure,* intimates that they sometimes erred in their chastisement, or that it was sometimes *arbitrary;* but it is not so, with that which God inflicts.

Ὁ δὲ ἐπὶ τὸ συμφέρον αὐτοῦ, but he, for our good, in order that we might be made partakers of his holiness. That is, God never chastises *arbitrarily,* but always to promote the real good of his children, to make them more holy, and so more like himself. Comp. 2 Pet. 1: 4. Lev. 11: 44. 19: 2. 20: 7, 26.

11. *Πᾶσα δὲ παιδεία λύπης, now all chastisement, for the present, seemeth not to be matter of joy but of grief. Πρὸς μὲν τὸ παρόν, during the present*, i. e. while it continues. *Μὲν* here corresponds to *δέ* after *ὕστερον* in the next clause, i. e. there is protasis and apodosis.

Ὕστερον δὲ δικαιοσύνης, but afterwards, it yields the happy fruit of righteousness, to those who are exercised thereby. Καρπὸν εἰρηνικόν is a peculiar expression. Some resemblance to it may be found in James 3: 18. Is. 32: 17. Gen. 37: 4. The meaning of *εἰρηνικόν* is to be gathered, by a comparison of it with the Hebrew שָׁלוֹם, which means, *good, happiness, welfare. Εἰρηνικός*, then, is *that which bestows happiness*, or *produces it*. This corresponds with the writer's design; who means to say, that afflictions rightly improved, will be productive of *fruit that will confer happiness*, such fruit as *righteousness* always produces. So remote a position of *δικαιοσύνης* from *καρπόν*, seems almost to indicate the necessity of repeating this word before it.

12. *Διὸ τὰς παρειμένας ἀνορθώσατε, wherefore strengthen the weak hands, and the feeble knees. Ἀνορθώσατε* is often employed by the Seventy, in order to translate the Hebrew חִזֵּק, which means to *establish, to make firm, to strengthen. Παρειμένας* (from *παρίημι*) means, *relaxed, let down*, consequently, *weak, enfeebled*. One might, (as many interpreters have done), translate *ἀνορθώσατε παρειμένας χεῖρας*, by *lift up the hands that hang down*. But since the same verb applies to *παραλελυμένα γόνατα*, it is better so to render it, as to make the application to both congruous; which may be done without transgressing Hellenistic usage. The quotation is from Is. 35: 3, where the Septuagint has *ἰσχύσατε* instead of *ἀνορθώσατε*.

The meaning of the verse is, 'Since all your afflictions are dispensed by fatherly kindness, be of good courage, do not indulge any despondency, but persevere in the course which you have begun.'

13. *Καὶ τροχιὰς ὀρθὰς . . . ὑμῶν, and make plain the paths for your feet.* In Hebrew, מְסַלּוּ מַעְגַּל רַגְלֶךָ, *make even* or *level the path of thy feet*; Septuagint *ὀρθὰς τροχιὰς ποίει σοῖς ποσί*, Prov. 3: 26. If the apostle has quoted here, it is *ad sensum*, not *ad verbum*. The meaning is, 'Remove all obstacles, or, disregard all obstacles, to your progress in the Christian course.'

Ἵνα μὴ τὸ χωλὸν μᾶλλον, that what is lame may not be sprained, but rather be healed. *Τὸ χωλόν* is a neuter adjective, used for the *abstract* noun, *lameness*, and therefore of a generic signification, designating *that which is lame*, or *the members which are lamed.* *Ἐκτραπῇ* means, *to turn aside;* which applied to the lame, is *to dislocate, distort, sprain, wrench*, the limbs which are *lamed.*

Ἰαθῇ δὲ μᾶλλον, i. e. it is better to make the paths smooth and plain, so that those who are lamed may walk with ease and safety, than to let them be rough and uneven, so as to endanger an increase of their malady.

The whole is a figurative expression, used by our author to convey the idea, that to go straight forward in their Christian course, regardless of any afflictions to which this may subject them, is the only way of safety, for those who are in danger of halting.

The writer now leaves the subject, on which he had insisted so long and with such earnestness, and proceeds to remind the Hebrews of various duties to which their Christian profession, and the times in which they lived, rendered it necessary that they should pay a particular regard.

14. *Εἰρήνην διώκετε ἁγιασμόν, studiously cultivate peace with all men, and holiness.* *Εἰρήνην* means here, *a state of concord and amity*, the opposite of contention and broils. To contentions the Hebrew Christians must have been much exposed, at this time, in consequence of the frequent injuries inflicted upon them by their persecutors. *Διώκετε, pursue with zeal* or *engageriess.* *Ἁγιασμόν, holiness*, i. e. a pious upright life, or, a life of consecration to God.

Οὗ χωρὶς κύριον, without which no one shall see the Lord. *Ὀπτεσθαι τὸν κύριον, to see the Lord*, denotes, *to come before him, to enjoy his presence, to be admitted to his favour.* Comp. Matt. 5: 8, and Wahl on *ὄπτομαι*, 2. b. See also 1 Thess. 4: 17. 2 Cor. 5: 8. Phil. 1: 23. John 14: 3, 4. 17: 24.

15. *Ἐπισκοποῦντες μή τις θεοῦ, see to it, that no one fail of the favour of God.* *Ἐπισκοποῦντες* lit. *seeing;* but the sense is the same, and the translation more perspicuous, if a new sentence be made here by adopting, as I have done, the imperative form of the verb *to see.* *Μή τις,* i. e. *μή τις ἦ,* the verb of existence being implied. *Ὑστερῶν* is differently rendered, by different interpreters. *Ὑστερέω* means, *to come late, to arrive after the proper* or *favourable time,* and is so rendered here by some. But *ὑστερῶν ἀπὸ . . .* is hardly capable of such a meaning, and plainly should be rendered, *be wanting in respect to, fail of, come short of, lack.* But what is *χάριτος*? Some answer, *the Christian religion;* and construe the whole phrase thus, 'Guard well against the apostasy of any one from Christianity.' But this warning has been so often repeated, and in terms so awful; and specially, as the writer appears, in v. 14, to make a transition from his great subject, to the consideration of other things of particular importance to the Hebrew Christians; it may well be doubted whether *χάριτος* has the sense thus put upon it. The writer had just said, that holiness was indispensable to that happiness which God bestows.' I understand him as now saying, 'See well to it, that no one fail of obtaining that divine favour, which is the result of holiness;' and so connect it, as a hortatory adjunct, with the preceding sentiment.

Μή τις ῥίζα ἐνοχλῇ, lest any root of bitterness springing up trouble you, i. e. see to it, lest any person of vicious life and example should rise up among you. Many commentators refer this to *apostates.* They are the more inclined to this, because a similar expression is found in Deut. 29: 17, which there characterises those, who turn from the worship of the true God to that of idols. But, as it is far from being certain that our author designs to make a direct quotation in the present case, I should not consider this reason, as in itself, of any considerable weight. Even if the *form* of expression be quoted, the application of it must depend, of course, upon the context. This respects not apostasy in particular, (as we have already seen), but other sins to which the Hebrews might be particularly exposed. No doubt the expression *ῥίζα πικρίας* comes from the Hebrew, פֶּן יֵשׁ בָּכֶם שֹׁרֶשׁ פֹּרֶה רֹאשׁ וְלַעֲנָה, *lest there be among you any root springing up,* [which is] *poison and wormwood,* Deut. 29: 17. The expression there used to describe an idolater, viz. *root of poison and wormwood,* is here applied to any person of an unholy life and deleterious example, who is called *ῥίζα πικρίας.*

The consequence is next described. *Καὶ διὰ ταύτης μιανθῶσι πολλοί, and by this many be polluted.* That is, the bad example of some, will have a pernicious, polluting influence on many. Guard well against it; for *ἐπισκοποῦντες* is implied before *μή τις ῥίζα κ. τ. λ.*

Μή τις πόρνος αὐτοῦ, let there be no fornicator nor profane person, like Esau, who for one morsel of meat sold his birthright. Πόρνος is explained as meaning *apostate, one making defection from the true religion to a false one*, by those who construe the whole of our context as relating only to apostasy. God often taxes his ancient people with adultery and fornication, in consequence of their having turned to the worship of idols. The meaning thus given to *πόρνος* may, no doubt, be philologically supported; i. e. the word is capable of such an explanation. But as I interpret the context in a different way, it appears to be more consonant with it, to take *πόρνος* as designating, *any person who indulges in gross and sensual pleasures*, or, *who is of an abandoned character.* So our Saviour often speaks of the Jews as a *wicked* and *adulterous generation*; not *literally* adulterous, (although doubtless this was true of some), but adulterous in the *figurative* sense of the word, viz. *sensual, vicious, abandoned, profligate.*

Βέβηλος is one, *who scoffs at religion* or *sacred things, who disregards what is sacred* in the view of heaven. The appellations *πόρνος* and *βέβηλος* may both be applied to Esau here, and probably are so. As to the application of *πόρνος*, see Gen. 26: 34, 35 and Gen. 36: 2. In regard to *βέβηλος*, see Gen. 25: 29—34. His birthright was not, indeed, a thing of religion; but it was, in those days, a matter of great personal importance and advantage. The argument is from analogy. 'Let no one give up himself to the gratification of his lusts, as did Esau, to the great grief of his father, Gen. 26: 35; let no one despise the distinguished privileges which Christianity confers upon him, like Esau who despised the privileges of his birthright, and parted with them for a mere morsel of food.' In the case of Esau, folly and unbelief were very conspicuous; for the land of Canaan, as he well knew, had been promised to his ancestors for a possession; and as the first born son, he must, according to the custom of those days, have a peculiar title to it. So those who reject the proffer of the heavenly inheritance,

and renounce their duty as Christians, may, with more propriety still, be called *βέβηλοι*.

17. Those, who conduct in such a manner, will hereafter weep with bitter lamentations, when it is beyond their power to recover what has been lost. Thus was it with Esau. *Ἴστε γὰρ ἀπεδοκιμάσθη, for ye know, that when he was afterwards desirous to obtain the blessing, it was refused.* See Gen. 27: 34—40. *Εὐλογίαν*, viz. the blessing of his father Isaac.

Μετανοίας γὰρ αὐτήν, yea, he found no place for a change of mind [in his father], *although he sought for it with tears.* See Gen. 27: 35, 38, 40. *Μετανοίας* here refers to a *change of mind* in Isaac, who had given the blessing (appropriate to primogeniture) to Jacob. The writer evidently does not mean to say, that Esau found no place for repentance in himself. *Αὐτήν*, sc. *μετάνοιαν*.

The sentiment of the whole is, 'Guard well against indulging any fleshly appetites; above all, against slighting the blessings and privileges which Christianity proffers; lest, having done this, you come at last, when it is forever too late, bitterly to mourn over your folly and wickedness.'

Such watchfulness the Hebrews had the more reason to observe, since under the new dispensation every thing was of a milder aspect, and of a more inviting, encouraging nature, than under the old. The comparison between the two dispensations is continued through vs. 18—24. The writer begins with describing the nature of the ancient one. The whole passage has respect to Ex. XX. XXI. etc. and Deut. IV. V.

18. *Οὐ γὰρ προσεληλύθατε . . . ὄρει, moreover, ye are not come to the mount which could be touched.* He means mount Sinai, which was an object palpable to the senses. *Ψηλαφωμένῳ, contrectabile, quod tangendum sit*, i. q. *αἰσθητόν, quicquid sensu percipitur.* So Tacitus, Ann. III. 12, *oculis contrectare*; and Cicero, Tusc. III. 15, *mente contrectare.* The idea of *de coelo tactus, thunder-struck*, is here assigned by some respectable expositors to *ψηλαφωμένῳ*; but without any good philological support. The Greeks use *θίγειν* and

Θιγγάνειν to denote, *the striking of thunder*. The Hebrews employ נָגַע, which the Seventy translate by *ἅπτεσθαι*. But *ψηλαφάω* answers to the Hebrew גָּשַׁשׁ and מִשׁ. Particularly in Talmudic and Rabbinic Hebrew, is מָשָׁשָׁא and מַמָּשׁ used to designate, *quod contrectabile est, quidquid sensu cognoscitur*. But, philology apart, the object of the writer in the antithesis between Sinai and Sion, plainly shews, that he means to designate the former as *corporeal, material;* the latter as *spiritual, invisible*, the object of faith, but not of the senses. Chrysostom has well drawn the comparison, when he says of Sinai, *πάντα τατὲ ἀισθητὰ, καὶ ὄψεις, καὶ φωναί;* of Sion, *πάντα νοητὰ καὶ ἀόρατα νῦν*. If the reader has any difficulty about the above explanation of *ψηλαφωμένῳ*, a comparison of Ex. 19: 12, 13 with it, will hardly leave any doubt as to the meaning of our author, who seems plainly to have had in his mind the strict injunction then made, *not to touch* the mountain.

Καὶ κεκαυμένῳ πυρὶ θυέλλῃ, and to flaming fire, and thick clouds, and darkness, and tempest. As to the particulars of the appearance at Sinai here mentioned, see Ex. 19: 16—18. 20: 18. Deut. 5: 22—26.

Κεκαυμένῳ πυρὶ means not simply, *fire*, but the burning of it, i. e. *flame;* see Deut. 5: 23, 25. It may also be translated in connexion with *ὄρει*, sc. *the mount that burned with fire*. But probably it was not the design of the writer, that it should be so taken: for, as he has arranged *ψηλαφωμένῳ* before *ὄρει*, while it qualifies it, in like manner he has arranged *κεκαυμένῳ* before *πυρὶ*, which it also qualifies.

Γνόφῳ, is probably the Aeolic form of *νέφος*, i. q. *νεφέλη*, for which the Aeolians use *νόφος* or *γνόφος*. The Seventy use it to translate עָנָן, in Deut. 4: 11, et alibi. It is doubtless used by the Seventy, and by the writer of our epistle, to designate *the thick dark cloud* that surrounded mount Sinai, when God appeared there. The word often means, *tenebrae*. Here it means, *the cause of darkness*, i. e. thick black clouds.

Σκότῳ, Hebrew חֹשֶׁךְ or עֲרָפֶל, the darkness or gloom itself, occasioned by the cloud upon Sinai and around it. *Θυέλλῃ* is designed, perhaps, to correspond to the Hebrew עֲרָפֶל. If not, it is descriptive of the tempest that accompanied the dark cloud, the thunder and lightning of Sinai, Ex. 19: 16, 18. 20: 18.

19. *Καὶ σάλπιγγος ἤχῳ, and to the sound of the trumpet.* See

Ex. 19: 16, 19. Probably the meaning is, *a voice like that of a trumpet*, i. e. very loud. In Deut. 5: 22, it is called *a great voice*; in Deut. 4: 12, it is called, *the voice of words*, i. e. articulate sounds; and in Deut. 4: 33, *the voice of God*. From comparing all these passages together it seems evident, that the meaning is, 'an articulate voice, loud like that of a trumpet.'

Καὶ φωνῇ ῥημάτων λόγον, and the voice of commands, the hearers of which refused that another word should be added to them. Comp. Ex. 19: 16, 19 and 20: 18, 19.

Ῥημάτων, things uttered or *said*. But it applies to any sort of speech, and, among other specific significations, it has that of *command*; see Luke 3: 2. Acts 10: 2. 11: 14. Heb. 1: 3. 11: 3. So דָּבָר in Hebrew, e. g. Est. 1: 19. Josh. 1: 13. 1 Sam. 17: 29. Is. 8: 10. Ex. 34: 28. So also צָוָה, *to command*, Est. 1: 17. 4: 13, 9: 14. 1 Chron. 21: 7. See Wahl, on *ῥῆμα*.

Ἧς οἱ ἀκούσαντες κ. τ. λ. The exact shade of the writer's meaning is, 'The hearers of which [voice] refused that a word should be added to *them*, viz. *αὐτοῖς ῥήμασι*, to those commands.' In other words, the exceedingly loud sound of the voice inspired them with such terror, that they declined having any more commands addressed to them in this manner.

20. *Οὐκ ἔφερον γὰρ λιθοβοληθήσεται, for they could not endure the admonition, "Even if a beast touch the mountain, it shall be stoned."* See Ex. 19: 13. The vulgate edition of the New Testament adds to this clause, *ἢ βολίδι κατατοξευθήσεται*. But no manuscript of any authority exhibits this phrase; nor any ancient version; nor any of the ecclesiastical Greek writers, Oecumenius excepted. It is, beyond all doubt, an addition of later times, taken from the Septuagint of Ex. 19: 13. *Οὐκ ἔφερον, they could not endure*, means, 'they were greatly affected with the severity of this command, viz. so that they could not bear it without awe and terror.'

21. *Καὶ—οὕτω φοβερὸν ἔντρομος, and—so terrible was the sight—even Moses said, "I fear and tremble."* *Οὕτω φοβερὸν ἦν τὸ φανταζόμενον* seems to me, plainly, an expression thrown in by the writer, in order to augment the description of the scene, which interrupts the regular narration, and is therefore to be construed as if included in a parenthesis. But as the whole of vs. 20, 21, is evidently a parenthesis, I have avoided the insertion of the

parenthetic marks a second time, and noted the words included within the inner parenthesis, by a dash at each extremity. *Καί*, which introduces the last clause here, *καὶ Μωϋσῆς*, has the force of, *and even*.

But where is the history of Moses' trembling? No where, in the Old Testament, is it expressly mentioned. It is implied, however, in Ex. 19: 16, where it is said, that "all the people in the camp trembled;" and Moses was with them, comp. v. 14. The fear, mentioned Deut. 9: 19, was on a different occasion, though this passage has often been adduced as supporting the affirmation now in question. The particular history, to which our author here alludes, was doubtless a matter of tradition among the Jews of his day; marks of which are still extant, in the Rabbinical writings. See Wetstein, on Gal. 3: 19. L. Cappell, on Hebr. 12: 21. *Ἔκφοβός εἰμι καὶ ἔντρομος* means, *I am greatly afraid*.

Τὸ φανταζόμενον, (the neuter participle being used like a neuter adjective), is to be construed as an abstract noun, sc. *species, appearance, sight*. This idiom is very common in the writings of Paul.

22. Next follows the antithesis to all this scene of terror, which accompanied the introduction of the ancient law. Worshippers, under the new dispensation, approach a scene of a very different nature. *Ἀλλὰ προσεληλύθατε Σιὼν, but ye are come to mount Zion*. Not the literal mount Zion, but the figurative, i. e. heavenly one. This is made plain, by the additional description which follows. *Καὶ πόλει θεοῦ ζῶντος, Ἱερουσαλὴμ ἐπουρανίῳ, and to the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem*. The epithet *ἐπουρανίῳ* here determines, of course, that a *spiritual Jerusalem*, a *heavenly city* is meant. Comp. Heb. 11: 14—16. 12: 28. 13: 14. Gal. 4: 26. Rev. 3: 12. 21: 2, 10.

Καὶ μυριάσιν, ἀγγέλων πανηγύρει, and to myriads, the joyful company of angels. So beyond all reasonable doubt, this clause is to be pointed, and translated; for *πανήγυρις* is not to be joined, (as some later critics have joined it), with *ἐκκλησίᾳ κ. τ. λ.* The structure of the whole paragraph demonstrates this; for each separate clause of it, (in vs. 18, 19, 22—24) is commenced by *καί*, and continued (where any addition is made to it) by nouns in apposition, without any conjunctive particle before them. E. g. *καὶ πόλει Ἱερουσαλὴμ ἐπουρανίῳ—καὶ κριτῇ, θεῷ πάντων*, etc.

The same construction, beyond all reasonable doubt, is to be adopted in the clause under examination. Dr. Knapp has arranged it in this manner, in his able dissertation on Heb. 12: 18—24, in his *Scripta varii Argumenti*.

Μυριάσι, lit. *myriads*, i. e. ten thousands, used by the Greeks to signify *a great and indefinite number*. In respect to the number of angels, compare Rev. 5: 11. Matt. 26: 53. Luke 2: 13. Dan. 7: 10. *Πανηγύρις* among the Greeks, meant an assembly of men convened on a joyous and solemn occasion; e. g. on the occasions of their public feasts, etc. The mention of such an assembly of angels, shews that the writer intends to describe the objects of the *invisible* world, as seen with the eye of faith; not things palpable, not the objects of sense. He has, moreover, a design to contrast this joyful solemn assembly of the angels with that awful one, who were present at the giving of the law upon Sinai. In respect to the presence of angels on that occasion, compare Ps. 68: 17 [18]. Deut. 33: 2 (Septuagint). Joseph. Antiq. XV. 3, 5. Gal. 3: 19. Acts 7: 53. Heb. 2: 2, with the note upon it.

Our English version joins *μυριάσι* with *ἀγγέλων* and renders, "to an innumerable company of angels." It also joins *πανηγύρει* with *ἐκκλησίᾳ*, and renders, "to the general assembly and church etc." But the latter is not permitted, on account of the manner in which the author has constructed the whole of his enumeration of particulars, in vs. 18, 19, 22, 23, which, as I have already observed, are each separated from the preceding one, by *καί*. If it be said, that '*πανηγύρει*, in order to be constructed with *ἀγγέλων*, ought to *precede* it,' the answer is, that in v. 19, *σαλπίγγος ἤχῳ* is constructed in the same manner as *ἀγγέλων πανηγύρει* here; as is also *διαθήκης μεσίτην* in v. 24. The Greek admits no other correct grammatical mode of construction, but that which is given in the translation.

23. *Καὶ ἐκκλησίᾳ ἐν οὐρανοῖς, and to the assembly of the first-born, enrolled in heaven.* *Ἐκκλησία, concentus, a concourse or assembly of people.* It is not a mere ecclesiastical word, but designates, by usage, any kind of assembly, *sacred* or *civil*. Here it designates the sacred assembly of the upper world. *Πρωτοτόκων* must not be literally understood here, but figuratively. Among the Hebrews, primogeniture conferred distinguished rights and privileges. Hence, figuratively taken, *πρωτοτόκος* means, *any one who*

enjoys distinguished rights and privileges, whether he is first-born in a literal respect, or not. Thus Israel, as beloved of God and highly valued, is called his *first-born*, Ex. 4: 22. In like manner Ephraim is named, Jer. 31: 9. So the Son of Sirach (36: 12) calls Israel. The same appellation of endearment is given to the predicted Messiah, in Ps. 89: 27. In a similar sense ἀπαρχή is used, in James 1: 18. I understand it here of those who had been most distinguished for piety and usefulness; such as patriarchs, prophets, apostles, martyrs, etc. Storr understands it as referring to the angels, and as descriptive of them; but without any good support from the *usus loquendi* of Scripture.

Ἀπογεγραμμένων, *enrolled*, a word employed by the Greeks to signify the inscribing of a person's name in a record, as a citizen, as a free man entitled to all the rights of citizenship. It marks, here, citizenship in the New Jerusalem or the heavenly Zion. The ἐκκλησία of such, is that ἐκκλησία with which Christians are to mingle, in the full and final enjoyment of their privileges. In a sense somewhat different from this, saints, while on earth, are spoken of as having their names *written* (γεγραμμένα, ἐγράφη, not ἀπογεγραμμένα) in the book of life; e. g. Luke 10: 20. Phil. 4: 3. Rev. 3: 5. 13: 8. 17: 8. 20: 15. 21: 27. 22: 19. Dr. Knapp interprets our text, as speaking of the saints on earth. But he appears not to have noticed the difference of the phraseology employed in reference to such; and certain it is, that the whole tenor of our passage has respect only to the *heavenly* city and assembly. *To be enrolled in heaven*, is to be entitled to all the privileges of a member of *the heavenly city*.

Καὶ κριτῇ, θεῷ πάντων, *and to the judge, the God of all.* Κριτῇ designates him before whose tribunal all must appear, that enter a future world. But to Christians he is a merciful, not a condemning judge. So means the phrase *God of all*, viz. of *all angels*, and of *all* πρωτοτόκων just mentioned, and (by implication) of all saints. To say, 'he is *their God*,' means to affirm, that he acknowledges them with favour and approbation. Comp. Eph. 4: 6. Rom. 3: 29. Heb. 8: 10. 11: 16. Acts 7: 32. Ex. 3: 6. Zech. 8: 8. Rev. 21: 37. In the same sense, I apprehend, is θεῷ πάντων to be understood in our verse; and then all difficulty ceases. In entering a future world, Christians must, indeed, present themselves before the tribunal of the eternal judge; but he is not a

judge severe and rigid; he is in an appropriate sense, *their God;* he will regard them with favour, he will treat them with kindness. Thus all is *inviting*, with respect to the heavenly Zion. The transposition made by our English version, *to God the judge of all*, is against the arrangement of the text, and fails to give the appropriate sense of the words. The meaning of *ὁ ἐπὶ πάντων θεός*, Rom. 9: 5, is different from *θεὸς πάντων* here, the former being "supreme God."

Καὶ πνεύμασι δικαίων τετελειωμένων, and to the spirits of the just made perfect, i. e. exalted to a state of final reward. This differs from *ἐκκλησίᾳ πρωτοτόκων ἀπογεγραμμένων ἐν οὐρανοῖς*, in that this latter phrase designates *the more conspicuous and exalted part* of the church invisible, (*πρωτοτόκων*), such as patriarchs, prophets, apostles, martyrs, etc.; while *πνεύμασι δικαίων* embraces all saints, "of every kindred and tongue and people and nation." See a like distinction in the heavenly world, adverted to in Rev. 4: 4. That the *elders*, mentioned in Rev. 4: 4, were of those redeemed from among men, is proved by Rev. 5: 8, 9. Then follows the *πνεύματα δικαίων τετελειωμένα*, in Rev. 5: 13. The passage in our verse, understood in view of this, is intelligible, and needs none of the varying and endless conjectures which have been made respecting it, nor emendations of the text that have been proposed.

Τετελειωμένων, i. e. having completed their probation, and arrived at their mature state, viz. a final state of glory. See on Heb. 2: 10.

24. *Καὶ διαθήκης Ἰησοῦ, and to the mediator of the new covenant, Jesus.* See on 8: 6. 7: 22, where the same idea is exhibited.

Καὶ αἵματι Ἅβελ, and to the blood of sprinkling, which speaketh better [things] *than* [the blood of] *Abel.* Respecting the blood of Christ offered in the eternal sanctuary, see Heb. 9: 11—14, 23. In respect to sprinkling, see 9: 13, 19. *Figuratively* or *spiritually*, no doubt, this is to be understood. Sprinkled with Jesus's blood, the worshippers in the sanctuary above may approach the presence of God, i. e. the inner sanctuary, confident of a gracious reception.

Κρεῖττον λαλοῦντι, instead of *κρεῖττονα λαλοῦντι*, for the weight of authority is beyond all doubt on the side of *κρεῖττον*. Literally

rendered κρεῖττον would be *something better*. But this is less grateful to the English ear, than the form of expression in the version. The meaning of the phrase seems to me quite simple and easy. The blood of Christ proclaims pardon and peace; the blood of Abel cried to God from the ground (Gen. 4: 10), for the infliction of punishment upon his murderer. Παρὰ τὸν (not τὸ) Ἄβηλ, is an elliptical expression, for παρὰ τὸ αἷμα τοῦ Ἄβηλ. That the verb λαλεῖ is *understood*, in order to complete the grammatical sense of the phrase, is quite plain. The form of the sentence, however, must be varied in order to *express* this verb. It would be thus, ἢ τὸ αἷμα τοῦ Ἄβηλ λαλεῖ.

Such is the contrast between the former and latter dispensation. *There*, all is awful, terrible, and threatening; *here*, all is alluring, gracious, and animating. Who, now, can adhere to the former, and renounce the latter? Such is the nature of the argument presented by the writer. He next proceeds to warn the Hebrews in the most solemn and affectionate manner, against a renunciation of their Christian faith.

25. Βλέπετε, μὴ παραιτέομαι means, *to deprecate, to decline, to endeavour to avoid, aversari, respuere, repudiare.* But who is τὸν λαλοῦντα? The sequel of the verse clearly shews that Christ is meant, who came from heaven to instruct men and warn them of their danger, or rather (with reference to the preceding verse) 'who speaks to men by his blood.'

To give efficacy to this warning, he adds an example. Εἰ γὰρ ἐκεῖνοι ... χρηματίζοντα, *for if they did not escape* [punishment], *who rejected him that warned them upon earth.* That after ἔφυγον, either δικήν, ἀπόλεσιν, or some such word is to be supplied, by the mind of the reader, is plain from the nature of the subject, and of the context. But who is τὸν χρηματίζοντα? *Moses*, I answer. The two dispensations are here compared, in respect to the penalty to be inflicted on the contemptuous and refractory. The legislator, or head of each dispensation, is introduced, as the person who addresses the laws or warnings of God to men. See the same sentiment, in Heb. 10: 28, 29.

Πολλῷ μᾶλλον ἀποστρεφόμενοι, *much more shall we* [not escape], *if we turn away from him* [who warns us] *from heaven.* See a similar commination, in 2: 1—3. 10: 28, 29. That χρηματί-

ζοντα is implied after τόν, results from common grammatical usage. Ἀπ' οὐρανῶν is meant to represent, either that Christ came from heaven and warned them, or that being in heaven he now warns them, viz. by his messengers. It is possible, however, that God is here meant by the writer, as he who warns them. But the antithesis between the head of the old dispensation and the new, in the passage, hardly admits of this construction.

The ellipsis of οὐ φευξόμεθα after ἡμεῖς, is sufficiently plain from the nature of the sentence.

26. Οὗ ἡ φωνὴ τότε, *whose voice then shook the earth*; viz. when, as with the sound of a mighty trumpet, waxing louder and louder, he spake on mount Sinai, so that the earth trembled; see on vs. 19 seq.

Νῦν δὲ οὐρανόν, *but now, he has promised, saying*, "*Yet once more, will I shake not only the earth, but heaven also.*" Ἔτι ἅπαξ corresponds to the Hebrew עוֹד אַחַת מְעַט, *yet once, after a little time*, Hag. 2. 6. The citation is from the Septuagint, but οὐ μόνον is an addition by the writer of our epistle, and is designed to give emphasis to the declaration. That the passage has respect to the changes, which would be introduced by the coming of the Messiah, and the new dispensation which he would commence, is evident from Hag. 2: 7—9. Such figurative language is frequent in the Scriptures, and denotes great changes which are to take place. So the apostle explains it here, in the very next verse. Comp. Is. 13: 13. Hag. 2: 21, 22. Joel 3: 16. 2: 10, 31. Matt. 24: 29—31 comp. v. 34.

Τὸ δὲ, ἔτι ἅπαξ σαλευόμενα, *now this "Yet once more," signifies a removing of the things which are shaken, as of created things, in order that the things which are not shaken, may continue.* The manner in which the writer understood the figurative expression in question, viz. the shaking of the heavens and the earth, is here plainly declared. It denotes a great change, a μετάθεσις, *removal*, or *abolition*, of the things changed, i. e. of the Jewish dispensation. The language which had been literally applied to the quaking of Sinai, when the law was given, is now figuratively applied, in the usual Scriptural way, in order to denote a great change of a moral nature.

Ὡς πεποιημένων is a *locus vexatissimus*. It would be of little use to detail the various opinions upon it; most of which seem to

have sprung from a misapprehension of the meaning of the paragraph, in which it stands. Even Michaelis and Storr interpret the passage as referring to changes in the *natural* world, at the end of time; most evidently, against the meaning of the writer. I understand *πεποιημένων* to designate simply *things made* or *created*, *χειροποίητα*, *caduca*, *mutabilia*; ideas necessarily implied, by a term which designates *things of a corporeal and created nature*, as here. The writer means to say, that the ancient order of things, viz. the Jewish dispensation, will be *changed*, *removed*, *abolished*, in like manner as the objects of the natural creation. In other words, like them, it is *caduca*, *mutabilis*, *evanida*; and like them, it will undergo a change. It really seems, that more difficulty has been made about the phrase in question, than was necessary.

All this change or abolition of the *old* dispensation was to take place, in order that a *new* one might be introduced, which shall undergo no change; *ἵνα μείνῃ τὰ μὴ σαλευόμενα*.

28. *Διὸ βασιλείαν παραλαμβάνοντες*, *wherefore, having obtained a kingdom which cannot be shaken*, i. e. the gospel dispensation, the *βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ*, or *τοῦ χριστοῦ*, or *τοῦ οὐρανοῦ*, a *regnum immutabile*. Plainly the *βασιλείαν ἀσάλευτον* here, is the opposite or antithesis of *σαλευομένων* in the clause above, which must therefore mean, (in such a connexion), *the Jewish dispensation*. The new dispensation is not, *ὡς πεποιημένων*, *like the objects of creation*, i. e. is not mutable, caducous, but *ἀσάλευτον*, *immutable*, *not to be shaken*, *not to be changed*.

Ἔχωμεν χάριν εὐλαβείας, *let us manifest our gratitude*, (*by which we may serve God acceptably*), *with reverence and devotion*. *Ἔχωμεν χάριν*, *gratiam habeamus*, i. e. *let us express*, *manifest*, *exhibit gratitude*, viz. for the *unshaken kingdom* which we have received, with all its privileges, preferences, and blessings. *Εὐαρέστως*, *acceptably*, i. e. gratitude for such blessings is due to God, and to render it will be well-pleasing in his sight.

Μετὰ αἰδοῦς καὶ εὐλαβείας, *with pious reverence*, i. e. let us not only exhibit gratitude to God for the mercies of the gospel, but let us add to this *pious reverence* for his spotless and awful perfections. *Εὐλάβεια* means, *piety*, *pious devotedness*, *the spirit of religious devotion*; and *αἰδώς* means *reverence*. I take the two words as designed to convey an idea of the *intense* pious reverence, which ought to be paid to the great God whom the gospel exhibits.

The principle, that one of two synonymous nouns, in such cases, may be employed for the sake of *intensity*, hardly needs to be again stated; and that one of them may be employed in the room of an adjective is equally plain; so that, if we choose, we may translate, "with profound reverence."

29. *Καὶ γὰρ καταναλίσκον, for our God is a consuming fire.* If this be not a quotation, the image is drawn from the description of Sinai (v. 18), which was still in the writer's mind. The idea is, that God, if called to punish unbelief, is not only surrounded by flaming fire, as he was on mount Sinai, but this is also *πῦρ καταναλίσκον, devouring, destructive, tormenting fire.* The awful punishment of unbelievers and apostates is set forth, by the expression in question, in a very striking manner. But probably the expression is a quotation of Deut. 4: 24, where it is employed by way of commination.

CHAP. XIII.

1. *Ἡ φιλαδελφία μενέτω, let brotherly love continue*, i. e. let it be constant, let it remain in exercise. I am, on the whole, disposed to believe, that the writer means to say, 'Let it continue to be as it has hitherto been;' for he has repeatedly commended them, in our epistle, for their social sympathies and brotherly feeling. *Φιλαδελφία* is the mutual love of Christians as such.

2. *Τῆς φιλοξενίας μὴ ἐπιλανθάνεσθε, cease not to practise hospitality*, or, *forget not hospitality.* This was peculiarly a duty, in those times of persecution and distress, when many were suffering the loss of their means of subsistence, and were obliged to cast themselves on the charity of their brethren.

Διὰ ταύτης γὰρ ἀγγέλους, for by this, some have entertained angels unawares. *Ἔλαθον ξενίσαντες*, a truly Attic mode of expression; for the Greeks were wont to join the verb *λανθάνω* with the participle of another verb, when they wished to express the idea, that the action indicated by that other verb, was done *unconsciously, undesignedly, without foresight.* Literally the phrase may be translated, *some entertaining angels were ignorant*, viz. that they were doing so. See examples of the kind referred to, in Gen. 18:

2 seq. and Gen. 19: 1 seq. The meaning of the whole is, 'Continue to practise hospitality, since greater honour and reward is consequent upon it, than you might be ready to suppose.'

3. *Μιμνήσκεσθε συνδεδεμένοι, remember those who are in bonds, as if ye yourselves were fellow prisoners.* The writer had before adverted to their past sufferings under persecution, 10: 32—34; and also to their present trials, 10: 36. 12: 3—5. Here he exhorts them *to sympathize with those who are in bonds*, as if they themselves were in the like condition, because they were continually exposed to be thrown into prison. A high degree of sympathy is designated by the expression, *ὡς συνδεδεμένοι.*

Τῶν κακουχουμένων σώματι, [remember] *those who are injuriously treated, as* [it becomes] *those who are themselves still in the body.* *Ὄντες ἐν τῷ σώματι,* i. e. daily exposed themselves to persecution and suffering; and therefore liable to need commiseration from others.

4. *Τίμιος ὁ γάμος ἀμίαντος, let marriage be honourable among all, and the bed undefiled.* So it should be rendered, because the whole strain is hortatory. So Schulz, "Ehrenwerth sei allen die Ehe." It is capable of another version, viz. *marriage is honourable for all*, etc. *Ἐν πᾶσι τίμιος* may also be translated, *is altogether honourable.* The first method, however, of rendering the phrase, seems to me preferable; as it is then made to be congruous with the context.

The fact, that such an exhortation is here addressed to the Hebrews, shews, either that some of them were chargeable with a breach of the precept respecting chastity, or that they were in danger of becoming so. Polygamy and concubinage were practised all around them, and had been for time immemorial. The demands of Christianity, then, in respect to these practices, might seem a grievance to some of the Hebrew Christians, and probably they were tempted not to regard them, and needed caution.

Πόρνους δὲ θεός, but whoremongers and adulterers, God will punish or *judge;* i. e. those who live in fornication, while unmarried, or commit adultery after marriage, will not escape divine indignation.

5. *Ἀφιλάργυρος παροῦσι, let your conduct be free from covetousness; and be content with what ye have.* *Ἔστω* is understood after *ὁ τρόπος*, for the sentence is hortatory. *Τρόπος* means,

behaviour, the same as ἦθος, *manner of life.* Ἀφιλάργυρος τοῖς παροῦσι, i. e. indulge no greedy desires for earthly possessions, but cheerfully submit to the allotment of providence in respect to these things.

Αὐτὸς γὰρ ἐγκαταλίπω, for he hath said, I will never leave thee nor forsake thee; i. e. God hath promised to provide for you, in the best manner, and you should put your trust in him. The phrase here quoted, may come either from Deut. 31: 6. Josh. 1: 5. or 1 Chron. 28: 20.

6. *Ὥστε θαῤῥοῦντας ἄνθρωπος, so that we may boldly say, "The Lord is my helper and I will not fear. What can man do to me?"* The quotation is from Ps. 118: 6; where the Hebrew, which corresponds to κύριος ἐμοὶ βοηθός, is יְהוָה לִי, *Jehovah is for me.* The verse is divided by the accents in Hebrew, as the translation above divides it. The apostle has given the sense exactly; ὥστε θαῤῥοῦντας ἡμᾶς sc. εἶναι, which is implied after ὥστε. The meaning of the verse is, 'Under whatever trials and difficulties we may be placed, we need not be filled with terror or painful apprehension; for God will help us.'

7. *Μνημονεύετε θεοῦ, remember your leaders, who have spoken unto you the word of God.* Ἡγουμένοι, *duces, praesides, leaders, guides, directors*, which here means, *teachers*; as the explanatory clause that follows clearly shews. Λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ, *the gospel.*

Ὧν ἀναθεωροῦντες πίστιν, and attentively considering the end of their manner of life, imitate their faith. That is, calling to mind the peaceful and happy death of those religious teachers among you, who gave you instruction respecting the word of life, imitate their faith, i. e. persevere in your Christian profession, as they did, to the very end of life.

Storr and others refer ἔκβασιν τῆς ἀναστροφῆς, to *the sequel* or *reward* that ensued, in consequence of the manner of life which these teachers had led. But I cannot find reason enough to believe, that ἔκβασιν may be properly understood in such a sense. It is not improbable, that the writer refers here to the triumphant death of Stephen, Acts VII., and of James, Acts XII. He exhorts his readers to follow the example of those faithful Christian teachers, who had died a peaceful and happy death, although, perhaps, a premature one.

8. Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς αἰῶνας, *Jesus Christ is the same, yesterday, to day, and forever.* That is, Christ is always the same, always ready and willing to aid you in all your trials; comp. 7: 3, 15—17, 21, 25, 28; also 5: 6, 9. 2: 18. 9: 24. 10: 12—14, 28. Ὁ αὐτός corresponds with σὺ ὁ αὐτὸς εἶ, Ps. 102: 28 [Sept. 101: 27], in Hebrew אַתָּה הוּא, which there designates *immutability* or *eternity;* for the parallel distich is, *Thy years shall not come to an end.* The absolute eternity of Christ, (a parte ante, et a parte post), is not here directly asserted; but the simple object of the writer is, to shew that 'he ever liveth to aid his disciples.' To refer the expression to Christian doctrine, and unite this verse with the one which follows, seems to me plainly a deserting of the obvious intention of the writer. Dr. Schulz construes the passage as I have done. Χθὲς, καὶ σήμερον, καὶ εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας, is a Hebraism, used to express the *past*, the *present*, and the *future;* and ὁ αὐτός, joined with these, denotes *immutability.*

9. Διδαχαῖς ποικίλαις παραφέρεσθε, *be not carried hither and thither, by diverse and strange doctrines.* Ποικίλαις καὶ ξέναις designates doctrines *different, diverse,* from true Christian doctrine, and *foreign* (strangers) to it. Such were the doctrines of the Judaizing teachers, respecting many of their ceremonial observances, and traditionary rites; and to these the writer here adverts, as appears by the sequel. For παραφέρεσθε, some manuscripts and editions have περιφέρεσθε, which Ernesti and some other critics prefer; but it is not supported by equal authority.

Καλὸν γὰρ χάριτι περιπατήσαντες, *for it is good that the heart should be confirmed by grace, not by meats, by which those have not been profited, who have been occupied therewith.* A difficult expression, about which there has been a great variety of opinion and conjecture. Χάριτι seems to me plainly to refer here to the *gracious truth* or *doctrine* of the Christian religion. The writer had just said; "Be not tossed to and fro by doctrines diverse and alien from Christianity." Next follows the assertion, "It is good to be established, [settled, confirmed], in the *gracious doctrines* of the gospel, rather than to put confidence in *meats*, etc. Construed in this way, all is plain and congruous. Βρώμασι indicates the various kinds of meats, which were distinguished by the Judaizing Christians into clean and unclean; the first of which might be safely and properly eaten; but the second must be avoided, on

peril of losing one's character for piety, and incurring the displeasure of God. All attention to this subject the writer regards as useless, and avers, that those who have been sedulously attentive to it, have reaped no spiritual profit from it. *Περιπατησαντες*, like the Hebrew הִתְהַלֵּךְ, means, *to be concerned with, to be occupied with, to bestow one's attention upon.* In regard to the *unprofitableness* of such an attention to meats, comp. Heb. 7: 18.

10. "*Εχομεν λατρευοντες, we have an altar, of which those have no right to eat, who render their service to the tabernacle.* A figurative expression, borrowed from the Jewish ritual, and accommodated to express the privileges of Christians. According to the usages of sacrifice, in most cases, some part or parts of the victims offered were reserved for the use of the priests, and, in some cases, were to be eaten also by the offerer; see Lev. 6: 26. Num. 18: 9, 10. Lev. 7: 33, 34. Num. 6: 19. Lev. 7: 15. 19: 6. But the עוֹלָה was a *holocaust*, i. e. an offering which was to be *entirely* consumed by fire; particularly, the עוֹלוֹת offered on the great day of atonement, Lev. 16: 14—16, 27. Lev. 4: 8—12. The reference, in our text, is to those sacrifices, a part of which were eaten by the priests and the offerers, in so far as the writer alludes to *partaking* of them. But when he says, that 'Christians have a sacrifice, of which those who pay their service to the altar have no right to partake,' he means, that the benefits, procured by the atoning sacrifice of Christ, do not belong, or will not be granted, to such as rest their hopes of salvation on the ritual sacrifices of the Jewish law, i. e. to such as continue to be disciples of Judaism, or turn back from Christianity to Judaism, and thus renounce the blessings procured for believers by the death of Christ.

11. "*Ων γαρ εισφερεται παρεμβολης, moreover, the bodies of those animals, whose blood was carried into the sanctuary as a sin offering, by the high priest, were burned without the camp.* See Lev. 16: 11, 14—16, 27. The construction of the verse is peculiar, and literally translated would run thus, "The blood of which animals was brought into the sanctuary the bodies of the same were burned, etc." To make the verse plain, the *arrangement* has been altered, in the translation. *Αμαρτιας sin-offering*, or *περι αμαρτιας*, [offering] *on account of sin*, which conveys the same idea. The object, in offering the blood of goats and bullocks in the most holy place, was to make atonement for sin. *Παρεμ-*

βολῆς, camp, refers to the time when the Israelites were in the wilderness, and all lived in encampments.

12. *Διὸ καὶ Ἰησοῦς ἔπαθε, wherefore, Jesus also, in order that he might make expiation for the people by his own blood, suffered without the gate. Ἁγιάσῃ, might make expiation*; see on 2: 11. *Διὰ τοῦ ἰδίου αἵματος*, comp. 9: 12, 14, 25, 26. 10: 19. Acts 20: 28. Eph. 1: 7. 1 Pet. 1: 19. Rev. 1: 5. 5: 9. *Ἔξω τῆς πύλης*, viz. the gate of Jerusalem; for he was crucified on Calvary, which was *then* without the walls of the city, although it is *now* within them.

Vs. 11, 12, are designed as a comparison, between the sacrifice on the great day of atonement, and the expiatory sacrifice of Christ. The blood of the former was presented before God, in the most holy place; the blood of the latter, in the eternal sanctuary above, 9: 12, 23, 24. The bodies of the beasts, used for the former, were consumed or destroyed without the camp; the body of Jesus was sacrificed or destroyed, without the gate of Jerusalem. The atoning sacrifice of Christians is analogous, then, to that of the Jews; but of infinitely higher efficacy; comp. 9: 13, 14. 10: 4, 19.

The particular object, however, of vs. 11, 12, is to introduce Christ as an example of suffering, in order to impress upon the Hebrews the necessity of perseverance in their Christian profession, amidst all their trials and difficulties. But the manner of introducing this example, is altogether in unison with the analogies, which are so often repeated in other parts of our epistle.

13. *Τοίνυν ἐξερχώμεθα φέροντες, let us, then, go forth to him without the camp, bearing reproach like his.* That is, 'since Jesus suffered persecution, ignominy, and distress, let us follow him, even if we endure reproaches like those which he endured. Let us leave the camp, i. e. the dwellings of the Jews, or, the profession of Judaism, and go over to the place where Christians dwell, although it be without the city.' In other words, Let us adhere to the profession of Christianity, although it be counted as ignominious and worthy of reproach. In respect to suffering *with* Christ, comp. Rom. 8: 17. 2 Tim. 2: 10, 11. 1 Pet. 4: 13. 2 Cor. 4: 10. Rev. 1: 9. That *ὀνειδισμὸν αὐτοῦ* means, *reproach such as Christ suffered*, is plain from the object of the writer. Comp. Col. 1: 24, which is exactly in point; and see on Heb. 11: 26.

14. *Οὐ γὰρ ἔχομεν ἐπιζητοῦμεν, for here we have no permanent city, but we seek for one yet future.* In 11: 14, the writer calls the heavenly inheritance which the patriarchs sought, *πατρίδα*; and afterwards (v. 16), *πόλιν*. Here the appellation *πόλιν* is used, because the writer had just been alluding to Christians being thrust out or going out of the city, viz. of Jerusalem, as Christ did, to suffer ignominy. The design of our verse is, to shew the Hebrews, that it cannot be of any great importance, should they be exiled from their dwelling places, and the habitations of their Jewish kindred; for in this world, no habitation, no place of abode, can be *μένουσα, permanent, lasting*. By profession, Christians, like the patriarchs, were seeking *πατρίδα ἐπουράνιον*, and consequently *πόλιν μέλλουσαν, an abode yet future*, a residence in the world to come.

15. *Δι' αὐτοῦ οὖν . . . θεῷ, by him, therefore, let us continually present to God the sacrifice of praise. Δι' αὐτοῦ*, viz. by Christ, i. e. let us present such an offering, by him who is our great high priest; not a sacrifice of goats or bullocks, but a *sacrifice of praise*. In other words, 'Let us, as Christians, offer praises to God, for the blessings of the gospel vouchsafed to us.'

Τοῦτ' ἔστι, καρπὸν ὀνόματι αὐτοῦ, that is, the fruit of our lips ascribing praise to him. The expression, *sacrifice of praise*, זֶבַח תּוֹדָה, is found in Lev. 7: 12. A phrase similar to *fruit of the lips*, is used by Hosea 14: 3, Hebrew נְשַׁלְּמָה פָרִים שְׂפָתֵינוּ, where Septuagint *καρπὸν χειλέων*. The meaning of our phrase is, *what the lips utter*, viz. when they ascribe praise (*ὁμολογούντων*) to God. So Prov. 18: 20 פְּרִי פִי, *the fruit of the lips*, i. e. what a man says, his words.

Ὁμολογούντων, like the Hebrew הוֹדָה, means, *to praise, celebrate, publicly acknowledge*. *Ὀνόματι* is here, as commonly, a periphrasis for the agent to whom the name belongs, viz. God; so that the sense is the same as *τῷ θεῷ*.

What follows *τοῦτ' ἔστι*, is added by the writer, in order to guard against the apprehension of any one, that he was exhorting them to offer the *ritual* sacrifices prescribed by the law.

16. *Τῆς δὲ εὐποιΐας θεός, moreover, forget not kindness and liberality; for with such sacrifices God is well pleased. Ἐπιλανθάνω* governs the genitive *εὐποιΐας* and *κοινωνίας*. The same strain of language, as before, is continued in this verse. *Benefi-*

cence or *kindness* toward the suffering, and *liberality* toward the needy, are called *acceptable sacrifices*, or *such as God is pleased with*. The sentiment is, 'duties like these, Christianity requires; not the blood of bullocks and goats.'

17. *Πείθεσθε ὑπείκετε, obey your leaders, and be subject to them.* *Ἡγουμένοις*, in v. 7 above, is clearly used in the sense of *teachers*, who were in fact the *guides* or *leaders* of the Christian community. If there be any difference between *πείθεσθε* in this case, and *ὑπείκετε*, the first has reference to positive obedience, in regard to any directions given them; the second prohibits any opposition to the teachers, in the measures which they might adopt to promote the improvement and the order of their religious community.

Αὐτοὶ γὰρ ἀγρυπνοῦσιν ἀποδώσοντες, for they watch over your souls, as those who must render an account. *Ἀγρυπνοῦσι, watch;* the image seems to be taken from the practice of shepherds, who watch with solicitude over their flocks, in order that they may preserve them from the ravages of wild beasts. See the like imagery employed, respecting the prophet Ezekiel, Ezek. 3: 17.

Ὑπὲρ τῶν ψυχῶν ὑμῶν, i. e. for you, בַּעֲדְכֶם. *Ὡς λόγον ἀποδώσοντες*, viz. to God, to whom "every one must give an account of himself;" particularly, every one put in a place of trust with regard to spiritual duties.

Ἵνα μετὰ χαρᾶς τοῦτο, [so obey] *that they may do this with joy, and not with grief; for this would be unprofitable to you.*

Ἵνα κ. τ. λ, I cannot but connect with *λόγον ἀποδώσοντες*. The sentiment is, 'That they may render their account with joy, because of the obedience which has been paid to their admonitions, and of the safety in which their flock are placed thereby.' An account of successful labours will indeed be a joyful account, to the ministers of the divine word. In respect to grammatical construction, *ἵνα* seems to be connected with the verbs in the first part of the verse, viz. *πείθεσθε ὑπείκετε . . . ἵνα μετὰ χαρᾶς κ. τ. λ.*; but *τοῦτο ποιῶσι* necessarily refers to something already mentioned, which the *teachers* must do; and what is this but *λόγον ἀποδώσειν*? I have been constrained, therefore, to supply the ellipse in the Greek here from the preceding context, and to translate, *So obey*, etc.

Μὴ στενάζοντες, lit. *not groaning*, i. e. not grieving, the effect being put for the cause. It is only a *negative* form of expression here, designed to repeat the same idea as is conveyed by *μετὰ χαρᾶς*, and to render it more intense. *Ἀλυσιτελὲς γάρ*, another negative expression, which means as much as to say, 'This would be very hurtful or noxious to you;' i. e. should their Christian teachers be compelled to give an account of unbelief and want of subjection in them, the consequences would be distressing.

18. *Προσεύχεσθε περὶ ἡμῶν ἀναστρέφεσθαι, pray for us; for we trust that we have a good conscience, being desirous in all things to conduct ourselves uprightly.* The request of the writer, that he may have an interest in their prayers, shews the friendly feelings and confidence which he entertained respecting them. He appeals to the sincerity and uprightness of his Christian deportment, as an evidence that he might claim a Christian sympathy for himself. *Ἐν πᾶσι κ. τ. λ.* augments, or renders intensive, the idea contained in the preceding clause.

19. *Περισσοτέρως δὲ ὑμῖν, and I request this the more earnestly, in order that I may speedily be restored to you.* This seems plainly to imply, that the writer was detained from paying those a visit whom he addressed, by some adverse circumstances, viz. either by imprisonment, sickness, or some like cause. It also implies, that he is known to them, and they to him; for it indicates that he had formerly been among them.

20. *Ὁ δὲ θεὸς Ἰησοῦν, now, may the God of peace, that raised from the dead our Lord Jesus, who, by the blood of an everlasting covenant, has become the great Shepherd of the sheep. Ὁ θεὸς τῆς εἰρήνης, God who bestows happiness, auctor salutis.* The Greek *εἰρήνη*, in the New Testament, like the Hebrew שָׁלוֹם, means, every kind of blessing or happiness. *Ὁ ἀναγαγών, who brought up, raised up, restored. Τὸν ποιμένα τὸν μέγαν*, comp. John 10: 11, 14—18.

Ἐν αἵματι διαθήκης αἰωνίου some join with *ἀναγαγών*. But what can be the sense of, *raising Christ from the dead by the blood of the everlasting covenant?* Almighty *power* raised him from the dead; not *the blood of the covenant*. Beyond all reasonable doubt, then, *ἐν αἵματι κ. τ. λ.* characterises the great Shepherd, who "laid down his life for the sheep, John 10: 15;" and who sanctioned a new testament or covenant by his blood, Heb. 9: 15—23. Matt.

26: 28. The meaning is, that 'the great Shepherd is provided with, or (so to speak) carries along with him, *blood* sanctioning a covenant which is of perpetual force.' So, in Heb. 9: 25, the high priest is said to have entered yearly into the most holy place, *ἐν ἀλλοτρίῳ αἵματι*, i. e. carrying with him the blood of bullocks and goats. See also Wahl's Lex. *ἐν*, no. 2. The phrase is plainly an allusion to the preceding discussion, in chap. IX. I have rendered it so as to prevent a mistake, in regard to its true meaning.

21. *Καταρτίσαι ὑμᾶς ἐν παντὶ ἔργῳ ἀγαθῷ, fit you for every good work*, i. e. prepare you in all respects to act worthily of the Christian name, enable you in all respects as Christians to discharge your duties. *Εἰς τὸ ποιῆσαι τὸ θέλημα αὐτοῦ, so that you may do his will*, i. e. perform all which he requires. This is of the same import as the dative with *ἐν*, in the preceding clause.

Ποιῶν ἐν ὑμῖν Χριστοῦ, working in you that which is pleasing to him, through Jesus Christ. That is, enabling you to perform all your Christian duties, which will be *acceptable, εὐάρεστον ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ, pleasing in his sight*, טוֹב לְפָנָיו, *pleasing to him. Διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ*, i. e. may he do this, *for Christ's sake, through Christ*, or, perhaps, *by the influence of the Christian religion.*

Ὧι ἡ δόξα Ἀμήν, to whom be glory for ever and ever, Amen. The nearest antecedent to *ᾧ*, is *I. Χριστοῦ*; and to him, it seems to me, the doxology plainly belongs. Other examples of a similar nature, may be easily shewn; e. g. Rev. 1: 6. 1 Pet. 4: 11. 2 Pet. 3: 18. Doxologies introduced into the midst of a letter, in this way, are characteristic of the writings of Paul.

22. *Παρακαλῶ δὲ ὑμᾶς παρακλήσεως, moreover, I beseech you, brethren, to bear with this word of exhortation; for I have written briefly to you.* Ἀνέχω means, *to bear patiently with, to receive* or *permit with kind feelings, to put up with. Λόγον παρακλήσεως* is simply, *exhortation.* Some refer this only to the last part of the epistle; but the whole is intermixed with hortatory admonitions. The writer, after speaking so plainly, and giving warnings so awful, endeavours to win those whom he addresses, to a patient toleration of his plain dealing.

Διὰ βραχέων, an usual Greek expression, for *briefly, within a short compass.* "But how," it is asked, "could Paul say this, when this epistle is longer than any one of his, that to the Romans,

and the first to the Corinthians, excepted?" But is it to be supposed, that those, whom the apostle now addressed, were acquainted with all of his other epistles; and that they would estimate the force of *διὰ βραχέων*, by a comparison of our epistle with them? It is much more reasonable to suppose, that the writer means to say, that he had written *briefly*, considering the importance and difficulty of the subjects of which he had treated. And who will deny this?

23. *Γινώσκετε ἀπολελυμένον, know ye that* [our] *brother Timothy is sent away.* See on the meaning of this, Introduction, Vol. I. § 19. pp. 132 seq.

Μεθ' οὗ ὑμᾶς, with whom, if he speedily return, I shall visit you. Μεθ' οὗ, in company with whom. Ἐὰν τάχιον ἔρχηται implies, that Timothy was then *absent*. Of course, *ἀπολελυμένον* cannot well mean, *set at liberty*. But if the meaning be, as I have rendered it, then is the reason plain why Paul should say, *ἐὰν ἔρχηται*. If Timothy was imprisoned at Rome, and *set at liberty* there, why should the writer (at Rome) speak of his *coming to him?* If in some other place, how should he know of his liberation, sooner than those whom he addressed?

24. *Ἀσπάσασθε πάντας ἁγίους, salute all your leaders, and all the saints. Ἀσπάσασθε* means, Present them with my kind wishes, and my regard for their welfare. *Ἁγίους, those who are consecrated to Christ, professing Christians, saints.*

Ἀσπάζονται Ἰταλίας, they of Italy salute you; viz. the *Italians*, see Introduc. I. § 19. pp. 139 seq. This shews that the writer was in Italy; from which country, he sends the kind greeting of Christians there.

25. *Ἡ χάρις μετὰ πάντων ὑμῶν Ἀμήν, grace be with you all, Amen;* a frequent form of benediction in the apostolic epistles. *Χάρις* means, *divine favour* or *blessing*.

The subscription to this epistle runs thus; *Πρὸς Ἑβραίους ἐγράφη ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰταλίας διὰ Τιμοθέου.* Like most of the other subscriptions to the epistles, it is of no authority. It is demonstrably erroneous here; for how could Timothy write this epistle, when the author says, at its very close, that Timothy was *then absent?* The author of this subscription, one is tempted to think, had either read the epistle with very little care, or with very little understanding of its contents.

EXCURSUS I.

Heb. 1: 2. *Δι' οὗ καὶ τοὺς αἰῶνας ἐποίησε.*

There still remains a difficulty in this passage, (in common with Eph. 3: 9), as to *the form of expression*, or rather, as to *the object of the assertion.*

In John 1: 3, it is said, *πάντα δι' αὐτοῦ* [*λόγου*] *ἐγένετο;* in 1 Cor. 8: 6, *δι' οὗ* [*Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ*] *τὰ πάντα;* in Col. 1: 15, *ἐν αὐτῷ* [*Χριστῷ*] *ἐκτίσθη τὰ πάντα;* in Col. 1: 16, *τὰ πάντα δι' αὐτοῦ* [*Χριστοῦ*] *ἔκτισται;* and in Heb. 1: 10—12, *σὺ κατ' ἀρχὰς τὴν γῆν ἐθεμελίωσας, καὶ ἔργα τῶν χειρῶν σου εἰσὶν οἱ οὐρανοί.* In all these passages, the creation of all things is simply ascribed to Christ; just in the same manner as in Gen. 1: 1, God is said to have created the heavens and the earth.

The reader is desired specially to mark the *mode* of expression, in the passages above quoted; as it is important for him to have a distinct cognisance of it, in order that he may perceive the difficulty which I am about to state. If the Scriptures had no where ascribed the creation to any other than the Logos or Christ, and had employed, in ascribing it to him, only such language as that just quoted above, I cannot perceive, that any interpreter of the sacred writings would have ever thought of ascribing creation to any other than to the Logos simply; I mean, that so far as the *Scriptures* are concerned, he never would have thought of ascribing any sentiment to them, in respect to this subject, but that which assigns creatorship simply and solely to Christ or the Logos. There is, plainly, no difference in the *mode of expression* in the Bible, which asserts creatorship of God, or which asserts it of Christ. I must be understood, of course, to affirm this here, only of that class of texts which has just been quoted above.

But there is another view of this subject, which presents difficulties that cannot be surmounted without some effort. The Scriptures do indeed ascribe creatorship to the Logos; as we have seen. But do the sacred writers mean to ascribe it to him *absolutely*, in the *highest sense*, as his *sole* and *independent act*? Or, do they represent him as creating by direction of the supreme God, and under his superintendence? In other words, Was the Logos the *original author* of the universe; or, was he only the *instrument* by which the *original author* brought it into being?

Questions easily asked; but answered with somewhat more difficulty, than unreflecting minds may at first imagine. All is to be resolved, by what the Scriptures have taught us. So one and all, who profess any sacred regard for the Scriptures, must concede. What then say the Scriptures on this point of all points, in respect to the great question of the real nature of Christ? Is he Creator by virtue of his *own*, or by virtue of a *delegated* power?

One thing it appears somewhat important to consider, before we advance any farther in the investigation of this subject. If Christ were only the *instrument*, employed by the supreme God to bring the creation into existence, and to arrange it in its present order, the sacred writers might assert, and might truly assert, that *πάντα δι' αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο*, or, *ἐν αὐτῷ ἐκτίσθη τὰ πάντα*. It may be said, with equal truth, that the church of St. Paul's in London was built by Christopher Wren, and that it was built by the monarch who was the procuring cause or author of the structure, and by whose direction and at whose expense it was reared. Every day, men familiarly employ language in this manner, ascribing the building of a structure, either to the owner, or to the architect, just as the nature of the case may require.

Do the Scriptures ascribe creation then to Christ, as *architect merely*; or, as *original author* and *deviser* of the whole? In other words, Is that class of texts, which ascribe creation to Christ, to be *modified* by admitting the idea, that creating by *delegated* power, i. e. (so to speak) as *architect only*, is meant; or, are these texts to be understood in their *highest* sense, viz. in the sense of ascribing to Christ or the Logos *original authorship, creating* in the *highest* sense?

To prepare the way for an answer to this question, we must make inquiry respecting a second class of texts, such as those which I shall now subjoin.

In Heb. 1: 2, the writer asserts, that GOD *made all things* BY HIS SON; and in Eph. 3: 9, τῷ [θεῷ] τὰ πάντα κτίσαντι διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, GOD *created all things* BY JESUS CHRIST. The latter clause, διὰ *I. Χριστοῦ*, is indeed wanting in some Codices of good estimation, and is rejected by Griesbach from the text. But Knapp and Tittmann have inserted it, and the weight of authority seems to favour the admission of it. That the sentiment is not without a parallel, is clear from Heb. 1: 2.

In these two cases, then, the assertion of the apostle is, that GOD *made all things* BY *his Son*, or, BY *Jesus Christ*.

Are these expressions, now, to be interpreted in such a way, as to qualify all the first class of expressions ascribing creatorship to Christ, so that they must be understood as asserting nothing more, than that he performed an *instrumental* or *ministerial* work only, and did not act as *original author* in bringing the universe into being? This is the simple question before us, divested of all extraneous constructions put upon either class of texts by opinions previously formed, or views adopted in consequence of reasoning *a priori*.

Whatever may be the answer to this question, it is evident, that nothing of importance can depend, either in respect to Heb. 1: 2, or Eph. 3: 9, on the word διά. It has often been asserted, that this preposition is employed before the genitive case, only to designate a *secondary* or *instrumental* cause. But this is altogether incorrect, both in respect to sacred and classical usage; as even the common Lexicons of the New Testament will shew. The cause, whether principal or instrumental, may be, and often is, designated by διά before the genitive.

Δι' οὗ, then, might designate, (by itself considered), the *principal cause* or *original author* of the worlds. This expression, however, does not involve the *nodus* of the difficulty, in the case before us. The assertion is not here, that *all things were made* BY *the Son*, but that GOD *made all things* BY *him*. In what manner, now, ought we to interpret this?

How the most noted commentators of the Greek church understood this difficult passage, is worth a serious inquiry. Chrysostom in explaining it says, "As the Father judgeth no one, but is said to judge by his Son, because he hath begotten him who is judge; so also he is said δημιουργεῖν δι' αὐτοῦ ὅτι δημιουργὸν αὐτὸν ἐγέν-

νησε, to create by him, because he hath begotten him who is the Creator." He then proceeds, "*Εἰ γὰρ αὐτοῦ αἴτιος ὁ πατὴρ, πολλῷ μᾶλλον τῶν δι' αὐτοῦ γεγεννημένων, for if the Father is the cause of him, much more of the things made by him.*" Hom. I. in Epist. ad Heb. p. 15. Vol. XII. Ed. Montfaucon. To the same purpose Theophylact, "*ἐπειδὴ δὲ αἴτιος ὁ πατὴρ τοῦ υἱοῦ, εἰκότως καὶ τῶν ὑπ' αὐτοῦ γενομένων, seeing the Father is the cause of the Son, he must surely be of the things made by him.*" Comm. in Heb. Tom. II. p. 650. edit. Venet. 1755. Here, also, the generation of the *divine substance* of the Son is asserted, and the appeal is made to this doctrine as solving the difficulty of our text. But as the idea of self existence, existence uncaused, and independence, enters *essentially* into all our conceptions respecting a nature *truly divine*, and is a *sine qua non* in all our apprehensions of a *Creator*, it is difficult for us to concede that the Father can be the *cause* (*αἴτιος*) of the Son in his *divine* nature, without of course admitting that the Son, as *divine*, must be a *dependent* being, a *δεύτερος θεός* only, as many have called him. The explanation of these fathers, (who accord with most of the ancient ecclesiastical writers), seems then only to remove one difficulty, by bringing forward another still greater. This explanation also is forced upon the text. The writer of our epistle does not say, nor intimate, that 'God created all things by his Son, inasmuch as he is *the cause*, (*αἴτιος, ἀρχή*, as Chrysostom calls him), of the Son.' Can it be proper to force on the sacred writer a mode of metaphysical explanation, drawn from the philosophy of later ages, and foreign to the simplicity of the Scriptures?

In modern times, the mode of explaining our text is founded on what the systems of theology denominate, "*subordination* in respect to the persons of the Godhead." Thus Owen, on Heb. 1: 2, says, "The joint-working of the Father and Son doth not infer any other subordination but that of *subsistence* and *order*;" he means the hypostatical subordination of persons, or order of their existence in the Godhead. The amount of the explanation, adopted by him and many others, is, if I rightly understand it, that God the Father, in the order of *subsistence* (not of time) preceding the Son, did, by the Son, create the worlds. But whether this explanation renders the text any more *intelligible*, may perhaps be well doubted. Especially so, as Owen, on the same passage, says,

"The *same individual creating act*, is the work of the *Father* and the *Son*; whose power and wisdom being *one and the same undivided*, so also are the works which proceed outwardly from them." But if the power and wisdom of the Father and Son are not only *one*, but the SAME UNDIVIDED; on what, it may be asked, is founded the evidence, that a SUBORDINATION *of subsistence and order* exists in the Godhead? If the *attributes* of the Godhead are *one and the* SAME *undivided*, how can we come at the *evidence* of a physical or metaphysical SUBORDINATION *of subsistence* or *hypothesis?* Can such a subordination of subsistence be in any way known to us, except through the medium of the divine attributes? But these are affirmed to be *one and the same undivided*. Are we able, then, to shew what the distinction in *divine essence* is; or to define the *mode* in which the metaphysical *essence* of the *uncreated Being* exists? Where is the passage of Scripture which does this? I am aware that an appeal is here made to those texts which mention Father, Son, and Holy Spirit in *connexion;* and particularly to the *order* in which they are mentioned. But of these texts there are only three. The first is in Matt. 28: 19, where the order just presented is observed. The second is in 2 Cor. 13: 13, where the Lord Jesus Christ is placed *first*. The third is in 1 John 5: 7; a text, which if not proved to be spurious, is at least thrown into a state so doubtful, that no considerate inquirer would at present think of appealing to it as authority.

Is then, we may well ask, the *order of subsistence* or *hypostasis*, (which is so much insisted on and so often appealed to by the schoolmen), a doctrine taught by the sacred writers? Or rather, is it not one of the inventions of metaphysical philosophy, in order to remove apparent difficulties in the sacred text? Can any one point out the text of Scripture, in which God is presented in a *physical* or *metaphysical* manner, so that his essence or mode of subsistence, in itself considered, is offered to our consideration? If not; and if God, only in his relations to us and the creation around us, *God as developed by his attributes*, and *not as he is in himself* or considered in respect to his *internal essence*, be revealed to us in the bible; why not be contented with what the Scriptures have taught, without forcing sentiments upon the sacred writers, which have been excogitated only by metaphysicians of later days?

Owen himself, after going through a protracted consideration

of our text, with that good sense and humility for which he was so conspicuous, adds, "It is not for us to inquire much into or after the reason of this economy and dispensation. We cannot by searching find out God, we cannot find out the Almighty unto perfection." He means, 'We cannot find out the economy of God's creating the worlds by his Son, and the doctrine of subordination which is implicated in this.' Happy would it have been for the interest of humble and candid inquirers, had this sentiment produced its proper influence over all the writings of Owen himself, and of many other eminent and excellent men!

Will not most sober and intelligent inquirers, of the present day, agree in saying, that the *nature* and *modus of the distinction* in the Godhead is not an object of revelation, and that it is BEYOND the boundaries of human knowledge? Let those, now, who write or teach respecting this momentous and awful subject, act consistently with such an avowal, and very much of the perplexity, which is still occasioned by incautious assertions in regard to it, will be saved.

The ground which Owen and so many others have taken, to explain the phrase in Heb. 1: 2, is not satisfactory, because it is built on the assumption, that we know that which is beyond the boundaries of human knowledge, and which, after much examination, I am compelled to believe is not revealed in the Scriptures.

The difficulty of our text, then, still remains. It would be presumption in me, to promise a solution of it that will be satisfactory. But as the subject is so deeply interesting, to all sincere and humble inquirers after the simple meaning of the sacred writers, I will venture to suggest a few considerations for reflection.

Words are the signs of ideas. Words are human, i. e. they belong to men; they are employed by them; and employed to designate, of course, the ideas which men have in their own minds. All these ideas are derived from sensation, reflection, or consciousness. The perceptible objects without us, and the mental phenomena within us, are all the objects from which we can derive ideas through the medium of observation. Reflection, or reasoning upon the knowledge derived from these, may lead us to many new ideas; all of which, however, have their basis in the perceptions of objects external or internal.

As words are merely *arbitrary* signs of ideas, so when employed in their original sense, they can never signify more than the things for which they stand. But words may be employed *figuratively*. When we come, by reasoning or reflection, to the knowledge and belief that there exists a Being who created the world; who is himself uncreated, eternal, and immutable; who is not the object of perception by any of our senses; and for the description of whom, none of the words of our language were originally formed; we are then obliged to apply to the description of this Being, words already in existence. But these words, it is plain, must in such a case be used nearly always in a sense more or less qualified, and differing from their original and *literal* sense. Even in expressing our ideas of the *moral* attributes of the Supreme Being, where there is a particular resemblance between him and man formed in his image, we do not apply to the Divinity the most common words, in exactly the same sense as we do to men. When we say, *he is wise*, we do not mean that he acquired his wisdom, or possesses it, or exercises it, just in the *manner* that men do. We mean that there is, in his wisdom, something analogous to wisdom in men; something which selects the best ends, and chooses the best means of accomplishing them. But we do not mean to imply, that the acts of selecting and choosing in the Divinity, are, in all respects, analogous to our own.

We say, *God is omnipresent*. But we do not mean that he is present every where, in the same manner as human beings are present at any particular place. We do not mean that actual *physical* presence of body, or of substance, is necessary to his being present; in other words, we do not mean, that he is *physically* diffused through the Universe. We mean, that at the same instant, he can act, and does act, any where, or every where. Here is *some* analogy between him and us. We must be *physically* present in order to act; and we say, therefore, that where he acts, he is present. This is true in some sense; but as to *manner*, how exceedingly different is his being present from our own!

We say, *God is mighty*. But when we speak of *might* in him we do not associate with it the idea of firm sinew, of vigorous muscle, of robust body, of mature age, of perfect health; all of which enter into our apprehensions of consummate strength in man. We content ourselves with one simple point of analogy. God has pow-

er to do whatever he desires to do; or, he is almighty. In this respect his might or strength is like that in men; it is power to accomplish the objects which strength or might is adapted to accomplish. But the might of the Deity infinitely excels that of men in degree. Here is one point of dissimilarity. It depends, too, on very different causes for its exercise. Here is another. But still, we speak of power in God, as frequently as we do of power in men. The imperfection of language obliges us to make use of words, in this way. But who that has any reflection will say, that the words which we apply to God are used *entirely* in the *same sense*, which belongs to them when they are applied to men?

In the same manner we might proceed, in the consideration of every one of the divine attributes, whether natural or moral. In regard to them all, we should find that there is only some one point of analogy on which our assertion rests, when we apply human language to the description of God; and that the *manner* in which he possesses or exercises any of his attributes, *physically* considered, is utterly beyond the boundaries of human knowledge; and indeed that it was never meant to be an object of assertion, by any intelligent man who makes assertions in regard to the Supreme Being.

If all this is well understood, we are now prepared to advance a step farther, and see our way clear. Nothing can be more evident, (I might say, self-evident), than that the eternal, uncreated, uncaused, independent, infinite, and self-existent God, must, as to his *mode of essence* and *existence*, be unlike to temporary, created, caused, dependent, finite beings, with a derived existence. The very fact that God is as he has been just described, and man as he has been represented, necessarily forces this conviction upon us. Nothing can be plainer, then, than that all human language, formed at first merely to express human conceptions of finite and created objects, must in itself be altogether incompetent *fully* to describe the Divinity. Nor could any language be formed by created beings adequate to this purpose; for the plain reason, that no finite being could ever have a *full* conception of the infinite and uncreated Being.

All our language, then, when used to describe God, must be considered rather as analogical only, than as capable of being simply applied to him in its *usual* sense. Any description made by it,

is only an *approximation* towards a full description of what is divine. This has been shewn above. And could this be remembered and rightly applied, in all our discussions respecting the nature of the Supreme Being, it would save much of the difficulty and darkness, which now embarrass this great subject.

No assertion, indeed, can be made respecting God, which, if its language be understood and applied *altogether* in the *same* sense in which it is understood and applied when made of man, will not lead to contradiction or absurdity. This is evident from such plain cases as those already presented; viz. God is wise; God is omnipresent; God is mighty. If there is still any doubt here, take another case. *God has knowledge.* This is certainly true. But with us, knowledge can be possessed only through the medium of corporeal organs of sensation; it is acquired successively; in time; within a limited space; by the aid of memory, of comparison, of reasoning, of imagination; and when needed for use, it is summoned by recollection. When we say, 'A man has knowledge,' we imply all these things by the use of these words. But if we say, 'God has knowledge,' do we mean to assert that he has corporeal organs of sense; that he gradually acquires ideas; that, limited by time and space, he does this; that he makes the *effort* of charging the memory with it; the *effort* of comparing, of reasoning, of imagination, of recollection, in any manner like ours? Whoever says this is an *anthropomorphite* indeed; such an one, too, as is not to be often met with, (I would fondly hope), in these days of better illumination respecting the exalted and spiritual nature of the Divinity.

From these obvious considerations, we may now proceed to examine the language of the sacred writers, in regard to the difficult point which suggested the subject of this Excursus. Two things seem to be equally the object of assertion, in the holy Scriptures. The first, that there is but one God; the second, that the Logos or higher nature which dwelt in Christ, is truly divine, or is truly God. Of the first, it would be superfluous to produce proofs here. The Old Testament is full of them; and the New as distinctly recognizes the same doctrine; see John 17: 3. 1 Cor. 8: 4, 6. 1 John 5: 20. Luke 18: 19. Matt. 19: 17. A formal proof of the second point would be out of place, in an exegesis designed only for the explanation of a particular phrase. It must suffice merely

to advert to John 1: 1. Rom. 9: 5. Titus 2: 13. 1 John 5: 20; the two former instances of which are so express, that no critical ingenuity can avoid the application of the term *God* to Christ; the third, when examined by the principles of grammar and of the *usus loquendi* of the New Testament, is scarcely less certain; and the fourth has never, yet, been satisfactorily explained away.

But how can the Logos be truly God, and yet *be with God*, and be *the agent* BY WHICH *God made the worlds?* Here lies, it must be confessed, the very essence of all the difficulty, which embarrasses so many minds; and on this point we must now venture to dwell with some particularity.

In the first place, our minds are embarrassed with the difficulty which such a statement respecting the Logos makes, in regard to the divine *unity*. Let us see if the source of this embarrassment cannot be distinctly pointed out.

Trinitarians have been accustomed, for many centuries, to characterize the distinction in the Godhead, by the word *person*. Whether this word was well or ill chosen, it is not my present object to inquire. Thus much is certain; many, perhaps even the greater part of men in Christian lands, have incautiously attached to this word, when used in respect to the Godhead, a sense nearly (if not quite) the *same*, as they attach to it in *common usage*. Not a few theologians and critics have, indeed, protested against such an application of the word; and some of those, who have been most eminent for their steadfast adherence to the belief that the Saviour possesses a nature truly divine, have raised their voice high against such an application of it; but unfortunately for the cause of truth, this voice has been listened to only by some of those who were friendly to a belief in the doctrine of the Trinity. Others, with different views, have commonly thought proper to pay no attention to such a protest; but to take advantage, in their efforts to oppose the doctrine of the Trinity, of the arguments which might be put into their possession, by taking the word *person* in its usual acceptation.

If now we speak of the Logos as a *person;* and of God the Father as a *person;* and attach to the word *person* the sense that is usual in common parlance; then it is certain, indeed, that the difficulty which lies in the way of supposing the Logos to be truly God, and yet consistently maintaining the divine unity, is altogeth-

or insurmountable. "Person is an intelligent substance;" (if I may use the language of philosophy for the sake of definition). "*Substance*," as defined by Baumgarten, a divine of the old school, of high orthodoxy, and of great metaphysical acuteness, "is that which can exist by itself, or unassociated with another thing;" *Substantia est id, quod potest existere ita, ut ponatur extra alterum*, Metaphys. 191. 36. 231—233. As defined by another logician and philosopher, famous for nice distinctions of definition, "Substance is that which exists, or may be supposed to exist, although it is connected with nothing else;" *Substantia est id quod est, aut esse posse putatur, etsimsi nulli alii sit junctum*, Ulrichs' Inst. Log. et Metaphys. § 316. To apply the word *person*, then, in the sense which such definitions necessarily afford, to the distinctions in the Godhead, inevitably leads to Tritheism, and of course to a *virtual* rejection of the divine unity. We may say, in *words*, that we believe God is one, although we assert that there are three persons in the Godhead as just defined; but nothing is plainer, than that in such a case we believe merely in a *specific unity*, not in a *numerical one*. Specific unity, however, might admit three thousand or three million divine beings, and yet consistently maintain that there is but one God; that is, it might do so, provided we allow the advocates of it that there is a *γένος θεῖον, genus divinum*, or genus of divinities. Human nature, for example is *one;* there is *but one* nature of man; yet the individuals of this genus are without number. That such is not the unity which the Scriptures assert of the Godhead, I need not stop to prove.

He who consistently holds the *numerical* unity of the Godhead, must, beyond all doubt, protest against the application of the word *person* to designate the distinctions of the divine nature, if that word is to be taken in its *logical* or *metaphysical* sense. For however one may hold to *words* and *forms* of expression, it is plain, that while he makes *such* an application of the word person to the Godhead, he in *fact* admits Tritheism, although he may be far from any design or any consciousness of doing so.

The views which have now been presented, may serve to explain the reason why many find it so difficult, or (as they think it) impossible, to admit the true divinity of the Logos. "How can he," say they, 'be the second *person* in the Godhead, and yet be

one with the first? How can he be *with* God, and yet be *God himself*?

And truly, it must be confessed, that this cannot be, provided the words in question are to be construed altogether *more humano*, i. e. in their *logical*, *common*, *usual* acceptation. But is it analogous, is it proper, to construe them thus? Does it develope a spirit of candid and fair inquiry, to insist that these terms shall be construed *altogether according to their common acceptation*, when there is not, as we have seen above, a single term significant of a divine attribute, which we ever construe in such a manner?

If this be correct, (and I may venture to say it cannot be reasonably disputed), then I see no very urgent reason why the use of the word *person*, in order to designate a distinction in the Godhead, should be rejected. It is true, it is not a word which is applied by the Scriptures to the Godhead, (for ὑπόστασις in Heb. 1: 3 does not mean, *person*); it is also true, that many well meaning individuals have been misled by it in regard to their conceptions respecting the Deity, and that those who reject the doctrine of the Trinity, have made great use of this word in order to render the sentiments of Trinitarians obnoxious: so that one might almost wish the word had never been introduced into ecclesiastical usage. But when the matter is examined to the bottom, it will be found that objections of a similar nature might be urged against the application of any *anthropopathic* expressions to God. The simple and the untaught may be easily misled by them; and often are so. How many, for example, believe that God is really angry, repents, etc. *more humano*, because such expressions are found in the Scriptures? Shall all such expressions be laid aside, because they are misunderstood or perverted? And if so, where shall we stop? for we have seen, that all language which is used in order to describe God, must be taken, of course and by necessity, in a *qualified* sense. The *abuse* of a thing is no valid argument against the *use* of it. Those then, who believe in the existence of a real distinction in the Godhead, in case they are careful to protest against the *literal* application of the word *person* to designate this, may still continue to employ the word if they think best; for it is exceedingly difficult, (as all will confess who have thoroughly studied this subject), to exchange it for a better one, or for one that will so well correspond with the representations of the Bible in regard to such a distinc-

tion. Certainly no term can be substituted for it, which will not, in like manner, be obnoxious to more or less objections.

If those who reject all distinction in the Godhead, will persevere still in maintaining, that to say there are *three persons* in the Godhead, necessarily involves the doctrine of *Tritheism*; and if they will thus continue, at all events, to explain the word *person* according to its *literal* and *common* meaning, and to charge upon those who believe in the doctrine of the Trinity the absurd consequences derivable from this; then they may indeed display their strength of attachment to their own views, and perhaps their skill in logomachy; but where is that candour and fairness toward those who differ from them, which becomes all who are seeking in earnest to know the simple doctrines of the Scriptures?

Suppose now, when one says, *God possesses knowledge*, he should be asked in the tone of reproof, 'What! Do you mean to assert that God has *physical* organs of perception; that he studies; that he charges his memory with ideas; that he compares; that he deduces conclusions; that he summons them up by the effort of recollection when he needs them? *Men* do *all* this, who have *knowledge*; but can all this be predicated of *God*?' Would any considerate man think these questions very reasonable ones; or feel himself compelled by them to abandon his assertion, 'that God has knowledge?'

Apply, now, the *principle* concerned in this case, to the idiom in question. The apostle John says, that *the Logos was with God; was with him in the beginning*; and repeats this asseveration, John 1: 1, 2. Christ says of himself, that *he was with the Father*, and partook of his glory, before the world had an existence, John 17: 5. In another place, John asserts that the *Son was with the Father*, 1 John 1: 2; and the Saviour speaks of the Father, as *loving him before the foundation of the world*, John 17: 24. He declares, that *he came out from the Father*, when he came into the world, John 16: 28. In accordance with this idiom, Paul says, that *God created all things by Jesus Christ*, Eph. 3: 9; and that *he made the worlds by his Son*, Heb. 1: 2. Now if such texts are to be considered as altogether *insulated*, and the principles of analogy in other cases are not to be applied to the language which they exhibit, then the conclusion, that Christ or the Logos is a being *wholly distinct* from God the Father, is clear and inevitable. But are these texts

to be construed in an *absolute, isolated* sense, and without any reference at all to others, which relate to the same connexion between Father and Son? Certainly not, if we follow the analogy of exegesis in all other cases. When John says that *the Logos was with God*, he tells us, at the very same time, as if to guard us against erroneously concluding that he is a distinct and separate and different *substance*, that *he was God*. When the Saviour spake of the glory which he had with the Father before the world was, he had just been addressing the Father as the only true God, John 17: 5, 3; so that no one could rationally suppose him to assert the existence of more than one true God. If Paul tells us that *God created all things by Jesus Christ*, and that *he made the worlds by his Son*, he also tells us, that Christ is *God over all and blessed forever*, Rom. 9: 5; and that he is the eternal and immutable creator of the heavens and the earth, Heb. 1: 10—12. Christ tells us that he who hath seen him hath seen the Father, John 14: 9; that he is in the Father, and the Father in him, 14: 10; and that all which the Father hath is his, 16: 15. Now whatever diversity between the Father and Son the first class of texts above quoted may seem to imply, it is plain that it is not of such a nature as to destroy the unity of the Godhead. Whatever the *distinction* in the Godhead may be, it is *not* that which makes *plurality;* it is not that which makes *personality* in a logical or merely human sense. But can we say what it is? Plainly not. A positive description is no where given in Scripture; and surely it would ill become us to pretend that we understand, without revelation, the uncreated substance and *modus existendi* of the Godhead. All that we can understand by such expressions as *the Logos being with God, becoming flesh and dwelling among us*, and *God's making the worlds by him*, is, that there is a distinction in the Godhead of some kind, which amounts to more than merely the different modes or ways in which the Divinity discloses himself to us. It is something which is not merely *nominal* or *logical;* which is not to be predicated merely of the external relations of the Godhead. It is something which renders it possible to affirm, in some sense or other analogous to the usual meaning of the words, that *the Son was with God*, that *God created the world by him*, that *he became incarnate*, etc; all which cannot be predicated, in the *same* sense, of the Father. Yet all this must be true, in such a *modified* sense, as does not infringe on the real unity of God.

Who, now, will undertake to decide what metaphysical distinctions or relations there may be, in the uncreated substance of the eternal God; and what are consistent, and what not consistent, with his unity? None, we may believe, but those who are either presumptuous, or destitute of cool and sober reflection. But although the *nature of the distinction* in the Godhead be truly beyond the boundaries of human knowledge, (as plainly it is), yet the *fact, that there is a distinction of some kind or other*, may be revealed. Indeed that it is revealed, seems to be a necessary consequence of allowing the two classes of texts above quoted to be true, and to modify each other. On the one hand, *distinction* is not to be so held or asserted as to infringe upon *unity*; and on the other, *unity* is not to be so held or asserted, as to preclude the possibility of any *distinction*. Who has found out the Almighty unto perfection? Are not all analogies from created, finite, temporal objects, utterly incompetent to convey adequate ideas of the infinite and uncreated God? Must they not from their very nature be so? Yet men will insist on applying all the analogy, which language imports, to God, in the same way as to themselves. We always conceive, for example, of *different* beings having a finite nature, as separated by space, as existing in time, and as having their own peculiar properties. When therefore we read of the Logos being *with God*, we very easily associate with this expression the analogy of one human being in company with another, or of some created thing associated with another that is a separate one. Then we are ready to ask, How can the Logos be God? One cannot, indeed, shew that he is so, if we will insist that all language is to be applied to him, simply according to the common application of it to human objects. But is such an application to be made? Can it be? John says, he is God; and Paul says, he is *God over all*. Then human language, of course, can only *approximate* to a description of him; the literal and full application of it, in designating his relations to the Godhead, is out of all question. Only very inadequate views of this subject, or the spirit of party, or that of disputation, can maintain the propriety of such an application.

We may come then to the conclusion, that when the apostle Paul asserts that *God made the worlds by his Son*, there is nothing in reality more difficult in this expression, than there is in those expressions which are found in the gospel and first epistle of John.

Whatever may be the economy of the Godhead to which Paul refers, it is not one which denies, or virtually takes away, either the unity of the same, or the supreme creatorship (so to speak) of the Son; for this he most fully asserts, in Heb. 1: 10—12.

We have seen, by the passages above cited, that the apostles, John and Paul, accord in their views both with respect to the *distinction* and the *unity* of the Godhead, and to the divinity of the Saviour. As they held these truths in such a manner that they harmonized with each other, so ought we to do; and consequently we should not give such an explanation to the one, as to destroy the other. In a particular manner, we ought to be guarded against making any assertions or definitions which are built on the assumption, that we know in what the distinctions of the Godhead consist. Some of the efforts of the school-divines, on this awful subject, are not only contradictory to each other, but their views are inconsistent with the true nature of a divine and *self-existent* Creator, as well as repulsive to the feelings of a cautious, impartial inquirer, who seeks after ideas of *things*, and not after mere *words*.

The suggestions now made, respecting the necessity of feeling that all our language when applied to describe the Deity must be restricted to a *modified* sense, are strengthened, by an examination of the descriptions in general of God, as given in the Bible by the sacred writers. They represent him, for example, as angry; as repenting; as being grieved at the heart; as laughing at the efforts of the wicked; as mocking at their calamities; as rejoicing; as weeping; as avenging himself; as possessing eyes, hands, feet and all the parts of the human body; as descending and conversing with men; as appearing to Abraham, Moses, and many others; as ascending; as riding in the whirlwind and the storm; as walking on the sea; as shooting with a bow and arrows; as whetting his glittering sword, and bathing it in blood; as clothed with the habiliments of a warrior, or in those of royal magnificence; in a word, as possessed of all the sympathies, and exhibiting all the phenomena, of a man. The most unpractised reader of the Bible knows this is true, and that more or less of it is to be found on nearly every page of it. Yet who, that has any rational views of the true spiritual nature of God, ever supposes that any part of all this language is to be applied merely in its *primary* and *literal* sense to God? Yet, in every case of this nature, there is some *real*

meaning in the language employed by the sacred writers. There is some point of analogy, between the *literal* meaning of the language as applied to *men*, and the *qualified* meaning of it as applied to *God*. When God is said to repent, the meaning is, that he acts in a manner analogous to that in which men act when they repent, i. e. he changes the course which he was pursuing. When God is said to whet his glittering sword, to bend his bow, and to take hold on vengeance, then he does that which is like what men do to their enemies, i. e. he punishes, he inflicts distress, he makes retribution for crimes. In all these and such like cases, the *manner* in which the divine Being acts is not intended to be described; but the *fact* that he does act, is what is asserted by the use of such language as has just been mentioned.

No one can justly say, then, that there is no *real* meaning in such language when applied to God, unless it is taken in its *primary* and *literal* sense. Such an affirmation would betray profound ignorance of the nature of language, as used in a qualified sense, and also of the true character of God. For if all such language respecting him, is indeed to be *literally* construed, then have the Scriptures cast no additional light on the *spiritual* nature of God, and he is still to be regarded, as the heathen represented him, viz. as one *altogether like ourselves*.

If it should be thought, that the class of expressions which are mentioned in the two preceding paragraphs, are essentially different from those before considered, viz. such as *God knows*, *God is mighty*, etc.; an examination of the whole matter will convince any one of his mistake. It is true, that the former class of expressions are more *obviously* figurative. We at once perceive, that, as God is not *flesh and blood*, they cannot be *literally* applied to him; i. e. we abstract from these expressions, whatever pertains to *modus*, whatever is borrowed from our earthly material structure. But is it not equally true, that whatever pertains to *modus* is, in the other case, to be in the same manner abstracted? For example, when God is said *to know*, does it any more imply the human *modus* of knowing, than it implies the human modus of acting, when he is said to lift up his arm in order to smite an offender. Most clearly not. The truth is, that, when sifted to the bottom, it will be found there is no essential difference as to the qualified nature of the language in both cases. In both, you abstract the *modus*, before you

apply it to God. In the one case, indeed, the metaphor is taken from our *corporeal* parts; in the other, from our *mental* powers; but this makes no difference in respect to the thing itself, except that in the former case the language is more obviously and strikingly to be qualified, than in the latter.

If, then, such expressions as those which have been considered, and all others which designate the natural or moral attributes of God, are, and must be, understood in a *modified* sense; then why is not the assertion that the Logos was *with* God, to be understood in a similar way? The manner in which one *created* substance, as contemplated by us, is *with* another, can surely afford no perfect analogy to explain the manner, in which the *self-existent*, the *uncreated* Logos is *with* God. And yet the most specious of all the objections to the true divinity of the Logos, are grounded on the full and *literal* application to him of such language.

One word, with respect to the *unity* itself of the Godhead. Is not this term, as well as all the others applied to the Divinity, to be taken in a *modified* sense? If any one will, for a moment, put aside the veil of *words*, and come to the simple contemplation of *things*, he will probably find himself much less able to tell what unity in the Godhead is, than he suspected. In the substances around us, proximity of parts united by some common influence, or subserviency to some common purpose, is essential to our idea of unity. A tree is *one*, because its several parts are intimately connected, are under an influence common to all, and are subservient to a common purpose, i. e. of producing fruit, or foliage. Other trees, indeed, of the like kind, are under the like influence, and subserve the like purpose; but the want of an intimate proximity of parts to the tree in question, is the ground why they are not *one* with it. One man, in distinction from many, consists of a corporeal frame thus intimately connected, and animated by an intelligent spirit. Every thing that has material parts is *numerically* one, only by an *intimate* conjunction of those parts.

But when we apply the term *unity* to spirit, and ask, What is that in which the unity of spirit consists? it will be found more easy to ask, than to answer the question. A spirit we do not suppose to have parts; certainly not, in such a sense as matter has, i. e. it is not divisible. God has no parts; he is a spirit. Proximity of parts, then, does not constitute his unity. Nor have we, nor

can we have, any proof that homogeneousness or simplicity of essence or substance, constitutes his unity. For, in the first place, we have no distinct idea of what the essence or substance, (if I may be allowed the expression), of the Godhead consists; and, of course, we cannot predicate *physical* homogeneousness or simplicity of that, respecting which we have no distinct idea. In the second place, as the most insignificant portion of matter has never yet, so far as we know, received an ultimate analysis from the highest efforts of chemical philosophy, so that any one can venture to affirm what its simple substance is, and confidently declare that it is homogeneous, and one only in regard to its component elements; will any one venture to say, that he has analyzed the divine substance, (I speak it with reverence), so as to be able with certainty to predicate physical homogeneous simplicity and unity, of the elements which compose it? How is it possible for us to make affirmations about the nature of that substance, of which, by our own confession, we are altogether ignorant? A man who at the present day should do thus, in any other science than that of theology, would be regarded as a mere visionary, or as a bigoted enthusiast for the party to which he belonged.

The qualities, then, of the substance or essence of the Godhead, or (to speak in other terms) the physical or metaphysical nature of the Deity, is that of which we are profoundly ignorant. We know there is one omnipotence, one omniscience; one Creator and governor of the universe; but do we know the internal relations and modifications of his substance? Confessedly not. How then can we with propriety reject the testimony of revelation, that the Logos is God, because of objections which our philosophy deduced from *a priori* reasoning may raise, in respect to the unity of the divine substance; all of which objections, too, are deduced from analogies that are taken merely from *material* and *corporeal* things? Truly, if the nature of these objections be examined, and the whole matter sifted to the bottom, by putting mere *words* aside for a while, and looking at *things*, it will be found, that we have less reason to confide in such objections, than some are ready to imagine.

The Christian, who holds that the Logos is truly divine, (and of course that he is *self existent*, eternal, and independent), holds to what Paul and John seem very plainly to assert; and he, who

admits that there is a distinction in the Godhead, (the nature of which is not developed, but which is implied in such expressions as those in Heb. 1: 2. John 1: 1, 2), stands on *Scriptural* ground, and on that too which is proof against all assault. For how can it be proved, that there is *not* a distinction in the Godhead, the nature of which we confessedly do not understand? If it be asked, How can it be proved there is one? The answer is, By a *revelation*. If such a revelation has been made, (and the texts cited above, not to mention others, seem plainly to imply it), then we are either bound to receive it, or to reject the authority of the sacred writers. Consistency must oblige us directly and fully to do the one, or the other.

As for all the illustrations attempted by divines, ancient and modern, of the physical nature of the distinctions in the Godhead, drawn from finite, material, created objects, the bare mention of them is enough to shew, that they must be imminently exposed to error. Who can draw any perfect analogies between *created* and *uncreated* beings, in regard to their *physical* nature and properties? And all the terms, and names, and dogmas, which have resulted merely from *such* comparisons, may be rejected in a mass, *salvâ fide et salvâ ecclesiâ;* and they ought to be rejected, if we would not expose the awful mystery of the doctrine in question to doubts, if not to rejection, by men who are not influenced in their opinions by tradition, nor by the authority of the schools. When the simple *Biblical* view of this subject is embraced, and the simple position of the sacred writers maintained, without adding to it any explanations or definitions merely of our own invention, then may more unity of opinion on this subject, be expected among professed Christians; and then will truth be less exposed to assault, from those who reject it.

We come, then, at the close of this protracted discussion, to the conclusion, that language, like that in Heb. 1: 2, is subject to such modifications as other parts of the Scriptures and the nature of the case demand. In other words, we can rationally apply it to God and to Christ, only in a *qualified* sense; just as all other language must be applied to them; most obviously, in a qualified sense. Whatever depends on *modus*, must be abstracted. *Facts* are aimed at, by the sacred writers, not the *modus* of them.

The expression in our text, therefore, according to every just law

of exegesis, must be so taken, as to accord with other assertions of the apostle and other inspired writers. But these do not permit us to attribute the act of *creating* to any but God himself, i. e. the supreme God. To this act, the ultimate appeal is made by the sacred authors, in order to distinguish the supreme God from all that is called God, in heaven or on earth; see Rom. 1: 20. Ps. 19: 1. Acts 14: 15. Is. 40: 25, 26. 42: 5—8. 43: 15. 44: 24. 45: 18. 46: 9. 48: 12, 13, etc. Now is it possible for the human mind, to appeal to any decisive evidence of supreme Divinity, unless the act of creation be such? The Deity can be known, at all, only by the developement of his attributes; and no developement ever made, or (so far as we can see) none which can be made, is so highly and decisively characteristic of "eternal power and Godhead," as the act of creation. So thought Paul, Rom. 1: 20; and so, until the whole structure of my mind is changed, must I think.

The Being then who *created* the world, is *God to me;* and from the nature of my moral and mental constitution, he must be so. This is a point that admits of no explaining away. If, therefore, Christ created the world, he must be, what John asserts him to be, GOD; and what Paul asserts him to be, GOD OVER ALL. But in what sense God can be said to have created the world by Christ, i. e. what is the *exact* meaning of a phrase, which refers to an internal distinction, (as it would seem), in the divine nature, is beyond the reach of our conception, as to *modus*. Enough, that it has matter of fact for its ground, viz. that the Logos was truly Creator. Enough that *creatorship* is so spoken of in the Bible, that we are not at liberty to predicate it of any dependent being. This point fixed, (and if it be not, we have no decisive evidence on which we can rely, that Jehovah is God), the sense of Heb. 1: 2, and of other like passages, is to be understood in a *qualified* way, so as not to gainsay what is plain and certain. This is as much as can be said, with safety; for the subject, to which such passages refer, is plainly one that, in most respects, is beyond the boundaries of human knowledge.

That the subject is not without difficulties, even in its Scriptural position, is what every candid and unprejudiced man will be very ready to confess. But it is a noble remark of Garve, (on Cicero de Offic. Lib. I. p. 70), "The better part of men do not, because they may discover a few difficulties which they cannot solve,

regard the whole system of acknowledged truth as uncertain. They can be aware that there is some darkness mingled with light in their knowledge, without being terrified by the one, or blinded by the other."

The effort to explain *every thing*, to define *every thing*, has led to the unhappy consequence of introducing scholastic phraseology and definitions, in respect to every thing about the doctrine of the Trinity. This not only bewilders many, but makes others believe that they have a knowledge of *things*, because they can use abundance of technical *words*; while the opposition of another class, who can detect the inconsistency and emptiness of these terms, is excited against the whole doctrine. The day, however, is coming, if not already arrived, when mere *names* will be regarded by the church as of little worth, provided they do not convey *intelligible ideas*. For the good of the church, also, it may be hoped, that the time is very near, when men will learn to stop, in making their inquiries, WITHIN *the boundaries of human knowledge*, and *neither to assert nor deny that, about which they know nothing and can know nothing*. Well was it said by a very sensible writer, "He who will not undertake to explain what is incomprehensible, but will seek to know where the boundaries of this begin, and simply acknowledge them when and where he finds them;—he does most to promote the genuine knowledge of truth by man."*

EXCURSUS II.

Heb. 1: 2. *Δι' οὗ καὶ τοὺς αἰῶνας ἐποίησε.*

It has been argued, that the expression, *God made the worlds by his Son*, necessarily contains an implication of *eternal Sonship*, or *eternal generation*; in other words, that Christ is the Son of God in his *divine* nature, and not simply considered as mediator. "How," it is asked, "could God make the worlds by his *Son*, if he had no Son until four thousand years after the world was created?" The answer, however, is easy. How could "God create all

* Jacobi, Götting. Recens. St. 197. anno 1785.

things by *Jesus Christ?*" And yet the apostle asserts that he did, in Eph. 3: 9. Is not *Jesus Christ* the appropriate name of the *incarnate* Logos? Of the Saviour as possessing *our* nature? How then could the world have been created by him? The answer is, that in both cases, and in all similar cases, the words which describe the person are used as *proper names*, and thus designate the whole person, in whatever relation he is considered. The Logos, who created the world, was united with the human nature of Jesus—with the human nature of the Son of God, i. e. the Messiah. And as the names *Jesus Christ* and *Son of God*, are evidently terms used to describe the *complex* person of the Saviour; so it is altogether accordant with the usages of language to say, that 'God created the world by Jesus Christ,' or 'by his Son;' meaning, in either case, by the Logos or higher nature united to Christ or the Son. So we say, *Abraham is dead*, meaning, that part of him which is mortal is dead; *Abraham is alive*, meaning, that part which is immortal lives. We say too, *Abraham was born in Ur of Chaldea;* yet he did not receive this name, until ninety nine years after his birth there, for before this last period, he was called *Abram*, not Abraham, Gen. 17: 1, 5. This is analogical with saying, *God made the worlds by his Son;* although the Logos did not receive the name *Son*, (except by prophetic anticipation), until he appeared in the flesh. Nothing is more common than to employ proper names, when once acquired, in order to designate the *whole person*, in all its different stages or modes of existence, without any reference to the time or manner of acquiring the proper name. At all events, if to say, that *God made the worlds by his Son*, necessarily proves that the Logos was *then* a *Son* when he made the worlds; the same reasoning will of course prove, that he was then *Jesus* and *Christ* also, i. e. a complex person having a human nature, because it is said, *God created all things by Jesus Christ.*

In the same manner, the expression of our Saviour, *What if ye should see the Son of man ascend up where he was before?* John 6: 62, would prove, if the reasoning on which we are animadverting be correct, that the SON OF MAN existed in heaven *before* he dwelt among men, i. e. that the *Word made flesh* did not assume this incarnate condition at the birth of Jesus, but possessed such a nature before, viz. while in the heavenly world. Now as neither fact jus-

tifies such a supposition nor the usages of language demand it, so the doctrine of *eternal* Sonship can never be built upon a principle of reasoning, which stands upon such a very insufficient basis.

EXCURSUS III.

Heb. 1: 3. *Ὃς ὢν ἀπαύγασμα τῆς δόξης καὶ χαρακτὴρ τῆς ὑποστάσεως αὐτοῦ.*

What can be plainer, than that the description, in Heb. 1: 3, necessarily applies to the *incarnate* Logos, to the Son of God as disclosing, in our nature, the Father to the world of mankind? A multitude of analogous texts might easily be appealed to; but those quoted in the commentary are sufficient. It is plainly the manifestation of God which the Son makes, that occasions the Son's being described as *ἀπαύγασμα* and *χαρακτήρ*; both of which imply, of course, what is *visible* and *perceptible*. But the Logos before the incarnation, while simply divine, was neither visible nor perceptible. Nor can we, with any propriety of language, speak of him in that state, in which he was simply the invisible God, as being only the *image* of God, or only the *radiance* of his splendour, or merely the *likeness* of his substance. *Ὑπόστασις αὐτοῦ*, *his substance*, I regard as equivalent to *him*, *himself as he really is*; for this would seem to be the meaning of *substance*, in the case before us, and not the designation of the physical or metaphysical nature of the divine *substance*, which neither Christ nor any of the sacred writers have represented to us, and of which, the Logos, is not an *image*, since he is ONE with the Father.

Others understand *ἀπαύγασμα* in the sense of *image, exact resemblance*, and *δόξα* as meaning, *divine majesty*; thus making *ἀπαύγασμα δόξης* and *χαρακτὴρ τῆς ὑποστάσεως αὐτοῦ* synonymous. They appeal, by way of supporting this, to an expression in Philo, who calls the sanctuary of the temple *οἷον ἀπαύγασμα τῶν ἁγίων καὶ μίμημα τοῦ ἀρχετύπου*, *an image* (as they translate it) *of the* [heavenly] *sanctuary, and a resemblance of the archetype*. But here *ἀπαύγασμα* may well be rendered *radiance*, i. e. *light*

emanated from the heavenly sanctuary, in reference to the heavenly splendour which appeared in the most holy place. Philo de Plantat. Noe, L. II. p. 221. edit. Francofurt. The book of Wisdom calls wisdom, *ἀπαύγασμα φωτὸς ἀϊδίου, καὶ εἰκόνα τῆς ἀγαθότητος αὐτοῦ, the radiance of eternal light, and the image of* [God's] *goodness;* which, although cited by them, is still less to the purpose of defending their opinion.

Ancient and modern commentators, who have construed these phrases as having respect to the *divine* nature and condition of the Son, have understood them as asserting an exact likeness between the Father and the Son, first in regard to *attributes* (*δόξα*), and then in regard to substance or *essence* (*ὑπόστασις*). I must, however, regard the phrase in question, as of the same nature, in respect to meaning, with the texts to which they have been compared in the commentary; and we may surely find, in the analogy of the Scripture and in the nature of the imagery, reason to justify this view of them. But as the explanation referred to has been so long insisted on, and so often repeated, it deserves at least some particular attention.

Theodoret has best exhibited the mode of argument, which is used to defend the sentiment in question. "Splendour (*ὀπαύγασμα*)," says he, "comes from fire. It has fire as its cause, but is inseparable from the fire; for fire and splendour proceed from the same source. If now it is possible, in respect to objects of sense, that one thing should be derived from another, and yet co-exist with that from which it is derived, you cannot doubt that God the Logos, the only begotten Son of God, is begotten as a Son, and yet that he co-exists with him who begat him as Logos, which [Logos] is *ἀπαύγασμα δόξης*. For the *glory* and the *splendour* have one common source. But the glory *always* existed; consequently the splendour. Fire and splendour are of the same nature; then the Son is of the same nature with the Father. Moreover, since the image of *splendour* abundantly shews the co-eternal and co-essential nature [of the Son with the Father], it has afforded occasion for the blasphemies of those who labour under the disease of Sabellius and Photinus. By another image, therefore, he [the apostle] refutes this blasphemy, since splendour does not exist in and of itself; for he adds, *χαρακτὴρ τῆς ὑποστάσεως αὐτοῦ, κ. τ. λ.*" Theod. Comm. on Heb. 1: 3.

In a similar manner, Chrysostom and Theophylact argue, calling the Son φῶς ἐκ φωτός. So the Nicene Fathers say, 'the Son is φῶς ἐκ φωτὸς, καὶ θεὸς ἐκ θεοῦ. All these plainly borrow their phraseology from the expression, ἀπαύγασμα τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ, which is referred by them to the *divine* nature of Christ.

But how incompetent any *material* objects are, to afford just analogies of the *modus existendi* of a *divine* and *uncreated* Nature, need not be again insisted on in this place. We might well ask, Is not the sun the *cause* of light? And does not the *cause* exist *before* the *effect*? Again; Is light in all respects *homoousian* with the source of light, the luminary from which it springs? Is the *radiance* of the sun, the *same* thing as the sun itself?

Chrysostom, Theophylact, and Gregory Nyssen, moreover, assert, that the expression, χαρακτὴρ τῆς ὑποστάσεως αὐτοῦ, necessarily implies an entire resemblance, in *all respects*, of the Son to the Father, with the exception of *separate hypostasis;* and this they maintain must be so, because the impression made by a stamp or die is exactly like the stamp or die itself. But it may be asked, first, Whether the writer himself of our epistle makes, as these commentators do, the exception of *hypostasis* from the completeness of the resemblance asserted? Next, whether an impression is indeed, in *all* respects, like the die which made it? For example; is the *impression* solid, or of the same material with the stamp; or does it possess the same physical attributes; or is it coeval with it? Such assertions, therefore, though they may be oratorical enough, and please the fancy of hearers or readers, vanish away before the tribunal of examination, and serve only to show the incompetence of any earthly analogies to give a true representation of the *modus existendi*, or of the physical substance of the Godhead. They also shew the imprudence, nay, the *danger*, of employing such figures, in regard to a subject of so awful a nature.

There can be no doubt in the mind of any man who carefully examines, that the Nicene fathers and the Greek commentators, one and all, held that Christ, as to his *divine* nature, was *derived* from the Father. So the Nicene creed, θεὸς ἐκ θεοῦ, φῶς ἐκ φωτός. So Chrysostom, commenting on the phrase in Heb. I: 13, κάθου ἐκ δεξιῶν μου, affirms, that "the apostle says this for no other reason, than that you may not suppose the Son to be ἄναρχον καὶ ἀναίτιον," i. e. *sine principio et sine causâ;* most evidently in

the very spirit of the Nicene creed. Yet we may ask the question, we cannot help asking it, Is then the Son, who is *God over all and blessed forever*—is he, in his DIVINE nature, *derived* and *dependent?* Has he, as *very God*, an *αἰτία* and an *ἀρχή*? And is it possible for us, to make the idea of *true* and *proper divinity* harmonize with that of *derivation*, and consequent *dependence?* No; it is not. The *spiritual* views of the nature of God, which are now generally entertained by enlightened men, forbid this; in fact, they render it absolutely impossible. But not so, in the days of the Nicene council, and of the Greek commentators. That they believed in the *divine* nature of Christ, I consider as altogether certain; but that their views of what is necessary to constitute a rational and defensible idea of a nature truly divine, were correct, is what no one, I think, who has read their writings and judged for himself, will now venture to maintain. Their views of the divine nature, were built on the metaphysical philosophy of their day: but we are not bound to admit this philosophy as correct; nor is it indeed possible, now, for our minds to admit it.

EXCURSUS IV.

Heb. 1: 3. *Ἐκάθισεν ἐν δεξιᾷ τῆς μεγαλοσύνης.*

To sit at the right hand of one on a throne, appears to have two meanings, both in profane and sacred usage.

1. It denotes *honour, friendship, peculiar approbation, a reward bestowed* on any one. Thus Solomon, when on his throne, directed Bathsheba his mother to sit at his right hand, 1 K. 2: 19. Thus, in Ps. 45: 9, the queen is represented as taking her place at the right hand of the king her husband. The mother of James and John requests of Jesus, that her two sons may sit, one on his right hand and the other on his left, during his reign, (*ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ σου*, Matt. 20: 20—23, comp. Mark 10: 35—40), i. e. that they may occupy the highest places of honour under him as king. In

other passages, Christ promises his disciples that they shall have thrones, in the world of glory, Matt. 19: 28; nay, that they shall sit down with him, on his throne, even as he sits down with his Father on his throne, Rev. 3: 21. So Christians are said to have a kingdom given to them, Rev. 1: 6; they are a *kingly priesthood*, 1 Pet. 2: 9; they reign with Christ, or in life, 2 Tim. 2: 12. Rom. 5: 17. James 2: 5. Matt. 25: 34. Rev. 5: 10. In all these and the like cases, honour, reward, an exalted state of happiness or glory, is represented by such expressions; but not actual *participation* in the *supreme* government of the universe.

2. To sit at the right hand of one enthroned, or to sit on a throne with one, also denotes *participation of command, authority*, or *dignity*. So the heathen often employed the phrase; e. g. Pindar represents Minerva as *δεξιὰν κατὰ χειρὰ τοῦ πατρὸς καθεζομένην, sitting at the right hand of her father* [Jove]; which Horace explains by her occupying *proximos Jovi honores*. Pind. Fragm. p. 55. ed. Schneider. Hor. Od. I. 12, 19. So Callimachus says of Apollo, that "he will honour the choir who shall sing what is pleasant to him; since he is able to do this, *ἐπεὶ Διῒ δεξιὸς ἧσται, because he sits at the right hand of Jove*, Hymn. in Apoll. v. 28. 29." The Greeks called him, who participated with another in his kingly authority, *σύνεδρος, πάρεδρος, σύνθρονος;* although they also applied these terms to any member of a council, or of a deliberative judicial assembly. In the New Testament, when Christ is represented as sitting at the right hand of divine majesty Heb. 1: 3, or at the right hand of God Heb. 10: 12, or at the right of the throne of God Heb. 12: 2, participation in supreme dominion is most clearly meant. Comp. Acts 2: 32—36. 1 Pet. 3: 22. Rom. 8: 34. Mark 16: 19. Phil. 2: 6—11. Eph. 1: 20—23. At the same time, the comparison of these passages will shew most clearly, that Christ's exaltation to the right hand of God, means, *his being seated on the mediatorial throne*, as the result and reward of his sufferings, (see particularly Phil. 2: 6—11, and comp. Heb. 12: 2); and that the phrase in question never means, the *original* dominion which Christ as Logos or God possesses. The sacred writers never speak respecting the Logos, considered simply in his *divine* nature, as being seated at the right hand of God; but only of the *Logos incarnate*, or the Mediator, as being seated there. So in our text, it is *after* the expiation made by the Son of God,

that he is represented as seating himself at the right hand of the divine majesty. And that this *mediatorial* dominion, is not to be considered simply as the dominion of the *divine* nature of Christ as such, is plain from the fact, that when the mediatorial office is fulfilled, the kingdom of the mediator as such is to cease, 1 Cor. 15: 23—28. Moreover, that the phrase, *to sit at the right hand of God*, or *of the throne of God*, does not of itself mean, *original divine* dominion, is clear, from the fact, that Christ assures his faithful disciples they shall sit down with him on his throne, even as he has sat down with the Father on his throne, Rev. 3: 21. It is exaltation, then, in consequence of obedience and sufferings, which is designated by the phrase in question. See an excellent dissertation *De Jesu Christi ad dextram Dei sedente*, by the venerable Dr. Knapp of Halle, (*νῦν ἐν ἁγίοις*), in Knappii Scripta varii Argumenti. Hal. 1824.

EXCURSUS V.

Heb. 1: 5. *Ἐγὼ ἔσομαι αὐτῷ εἰς πατέρα, καὶ αὐτὸς ἔσται μοι εἰς υἱόν.*

A difficulty still remains, in regard to the application of 2 Sam. 7: 14 to Christ. In the very same verse, which contains the quotation made by the apostle, is contained the following expression; "If he commit iniquity, I will chasten him with the rod of men, and with the stripes of the children of men;" i. e. I will inflict such punishment, as men receive on account of transgression. Can it well be said respecting the Son of God, "If he commit iniquity, etc.?" Where can any analogy in Scripture be found, of such language applied to him? The answer must be, No where. But by a nearer inspection of the whole prophecy, and by comparing it with other predictions of a similar nature, perhaps the difficulty presented may be diminished, if not removed. What hinders, that

God should promise both *temporal* and *spiritual* blessings to David, in consideration of his piety? See 2 Sam. 7: 1—13. Why could he not promise him, that he should have successors on the throne, who should, like other men, fall into sin, and be chastened for it? And yet, that among those kings who should descend from him, there should be one, who was the Son of God in a peculiar sense, who was destined to a dignity—to a throne—of a most exalted nature? Such at least seems to be the exposition by the author of the eighty ninth Psalm, vs. 29—37.

Compare this now with the promises made to Abraham, Gen. 12: 1—3. 15: 1—6. 17: 1—8. These passages certainly contain assurances, that Abraham should have a literal, numerous offspring, and that they should inherit the land of Canaan; see Gen. 15: 7—18. Yet they also contain assurances of a seed, in whom all nations should be blessed, Gal. 3: 14—17; and of a seed who should be the heirs of Abraham's faith, i. e. resemble him in regard to faith or belief, Gal. 3: 6—8. It may be difficult for us to ascertain, in some cases, where the *temporal* promise ends, and the *spiritual* one begins; and so *vice versâ;* because both are couched, as usual, in similar language. But this does not shew that there is any absurdity, or any improbability, in the supposition that God may have promised, and that he has promised, blessings both spiritual and temporal, at the same time. Did he not engage that David should have successors on his *earthly* throne; and also that he should have a Son who would sit on a *spiritual* throne, and have a kingdom of which David's own was but a mere type? Luke 1: 32, 33. Rom. 1: 3, 4. Admitting this, our difficulty is diminished, if not removed. The "iniquity committed" is predicated of that part of David's seed, who might commit it, i. e. his successors on the *national* throne; while the more exalted condition, predicated of his successor, belongs to him to whom was given a *kingdom over all.*

If you say, 'Thus interpreted, the prophecy seems to be in a great measure general, and difficult to be *definitely* interpreted;' the answer is, So it was designed to be. The *general* idea only was intended to be communicated, of some future most distinguished progeny of David. Very much of our difficulty in interpreting most of the prophecies of the Old Testament, arises from aiming to make them more *specific* and *definite*, than they were originally in-

tended to be. When we shall have thoroughly learned, that "the Law made nothing perfect," we shall find less difficulty in the interpretation both of the Old and New Testament.

EXCURSUS VI.

Heb. 1: 6. *Καὶ προσκυνησάτωσαν αὐτῷ πάντες ἄγγελοι θεοῦ.*

As nearly all the commentators on our epistle have admitted, that the one or the other of these passages is actually quoted by the apostle, the difficulties to which such a supposition is exposed, should be stated.

In Deut. 32: 43 [Sept.], the very words are found, which appear in our text. But (1) They are found *only* in the Septuagint version; the Hebrew, and all the ancient versions, omitting them. (2) The copies of the Septuagint itself are not agreed respecting them. The Codex Alex. reads *υἱοὶ θεοῦ* instead of *ἄγγελοι θεοῦ*, and one Codex at Oxford omits the whole clause. (3) The subject connected with this command to the angels, (if we admit the clause in the Septuagint to be a part of the sacred text), has no relation to the Messiah. The context celebrates the victory over the enemies of Israel, which God will achieve. After saying, that "his arrows should be drunk with blood, and that his sword should devour flesh, with the blood of the slain and of captives, from the time when he begins to take vengeance on the enemy;" the Septuagint (not the Hebrew) immediately inserts, *εὐφράνθητε οὐρανοὶ ἅμα αὐτῷ, καὶ προσκυνησάτωσαν αὐτῷ πάντες ἄγγελοι θεοῦ.* This, in the place where it stands, must needs mean, 'Let the inhabitants of the heavenly world rejoice in the victory of God over the enemies of his people, and let them pay their adoration to him.' But the Messiah does not seem to be at all alluded to, any where in the context; much less described as being *introduced into the world.* I should therefore think it very improbable, if the apostle meant to quote Scripture, that he meant to quote *this* Scripture, on the pres-

ent occasion; for we have no knowledge, (unless it be implied in our text), that the Jews of his time were wont to apply this passage to the Messiah. Still, it is a *possible* case that he quoted the words of Deut. 32: 43, merely as fitted to express the idea which he intended to convey; just as we now borrow Scripture language, every day, to convey our own ideas, without feeling it to be at all necessary to prove, in every case, that the same meaning was originally conveyed by the words which we employ, as we attach to them in our discourse. Such a use, it is well known, is not unfrequently made of passages from the Old Testament by the writers of the New; and such an one, Storr maintains, is here made by the apostle, of the words of the Septuagint in Deut. 32: 43.

The probability, however, all things considered, is in favour of a quotation, (if it be necessary to suppose a quotation), from Ps. 97: 7 (Sept. 96: 7); where the Sept. has, *προσκυνήσατε αὐτῷ πάντες ἄγγελοι αὐτοῦ*, as a translation of the Heb. הִשְׁתַּחֲווּ־לוֹ כָּל־אֱלֹהִים, *worship him all ye Elohim*. Here *αὐτοῦ*, in the Septuagint, stands after *ἄγγελοι*, but in Heb. 1: 6 it is *θεοῦ*, and *καὶ* in our quotation is wanting in the Sept. But any one who has compared the quotations of the N. Test. from the Old, either with the Hebrew or Septuagint, must have seen that very few of them are *verbatim*. The variation here of the quotation from the original, is so small, and so entirely unconcerned with the sense of the passage, that the discrepancy will not be any hindrance at all to the supposition, that Ps. 97: 7 may have been quoted. Yet the subject of this Psalm does not, at first view, seem to be the Messiah. The universal reign of Jehovah, his victory over his enemies, the manifestation of his glory to all nations, and the confusion of idolaters, are celebrated in the context. The verse from which our quotation is made runs thus; "Confounded be all they that serve graven images, that boast themselves of their idols, *προσκυνήσατε αὐτῷ πάντες ἄγγελοι θεοῦ*, כָּל־אֱלֹהִים;" i. e. 'let all created things, which are the objects of worship, instead of receiving adoration, pay it to Jehovah. Jehovah alone is the proper object of religious homage.'

Yet it is certainly a *possible* case, that this very Psalm celebrates the coming and empire of Christ, who was, as Simeon says, Luke 2: 32, *φῶς εἰς ἀποκάλυψιν ἐθνῶν, καὶ δόξαν λαοῦ Ἰσραήλ*, (comp. Ps. 97: 6); and whose coming was to destroy idolatry, and fill the hearts of the righteous with gladness, Ps. 97: 11, 12. It must be

admitted, however, that if the 97th Psalm was designed to be applied to the Messiah, it is one of those which are much less definite and plain in regard to such an application, than several others. The Jews, as Kimchi asserts, were wont to apply all the Psalms, from Ps. xciii. to Ps. ci., to the Messiah. If such an explanation was current in the time of Paul, it would give additional force to the appeal here made. And even if Paul himself did not regard Ps. xcvii. as originally designed to be applied to the Messiah, he might still use the words of it as descriptive of a fact which took place, at the time of the Saviour's birth. The Jewish Christians, whom he addressed, could not have been ignorant of what happened in regard to the angels, at the time of this birth. Supposing, then, that the original Hebrew of the 97th Psalm only means, 'Worship him all ye who are worshipped, [כָּל־אֱלֹהִים];' and that the Seventy translated this as it now appears in their version; why could not Paul make use of their words, to describe facts which happened in later times? If you say, 'This would be only to foster an erroneous translation of the Hebrew by the Seventy, and an erroneous application of it by the Jews;' the answer is, The fact itself is not an error, viz. that the angels worshipped the Saviour. The words of Ps. 97: 7, thus applied, designate what is really true. If the Jews to whom they were originally addressed, were accustomed to apply them to the Messiah, then the use which the apostle makes of them would be the more impressive; and impressive of an idea founded in reality, viz. that the Son of God was the object of angelic worship.

That the apostle, however, designed any thing more, than merely to use a phrase well known to the readers of the Septuagint version, borrowed from Ps. 97: 7, and accommodated to express his own ideas, need not be supposed; and cannot, indeed, well be proved. But if any are not content with this, (which I should myself prefer, provided we allow it to be an actual quotation); then it is certainly very possible to suppose, that the 97th Psalm relates to the coming and kingdom of the Messiah, and that the appeal to it for a proof passage relative to him, is strictly proper, and not difficult to be understood. In either way, the difficulty which offers itself to the mind, on the first examination of the text, is greatly diminished, if not wholly removed, so far as appeal by way of quotation is concerned.

For my own part, I do not regard it as *necessary* to suppose that the phrase in question is quoted at all. Surely it is not improbable, that the writer means only to say, 'The Father, who introduced the Son into the world, said, *προσκυνησάτωσαν κ. τ. λ.*' The Christian Jews, who cannot be supposed to be ignorant of what had happened at the time of the Saviour's birth, could hardly doubt of the writer's meaning. Thus the difficulty of the text would be removed. But if a *quotation* be insisted on; then, with Storr, I am inclined, as before suggested, to regard it as simply using a Septuagint phrase, in order to convey the apostle's own ideas. Yet the exposition, which is founded on the application of the 97th Psalm to the Messiah, and which explains our text as the quotation of an actual prophecy, is not impossible; and perhaps not even improbable.

One question, however, still remains. How could the Seventy, and Paul after them, translate אֱלֹהִים by *angels?* It is admitted, that the great body of lexicographers and critics, in modern times, reject the sense of the word here given. But usage, after all, pleads in favour of it. The Septuagint render אֵל (*God*) by *ἄγγελος*, in Job 20: 15; and אֱלֹהִים by *ἄγγελοι*, in Ps. 8: 6. 97: (96:) 7. 137: 1. Paul follows them, by quoting Ps. 8: 6 in Heb. 2: 7; and also by quoting Ps. 97: 7, in the verse before us, i. e. supposing that he does actually quote it. Is not this sufficient evidence that there was a *usus loquendi* among the Jews, which applied the word אֱלֹהִים occasionally to designate *angels?* It is admitted, that kings and magistrates are called *Elohim*, because of their rank or dignity. Is there any thing improbable in the supposition, that angels may be also called אֱלֹהִים, who at present are elevated above men, Heb. 2: 7? *Facts*, and not *suppositions*, are evidences of the *usus loquendi* of the Jewish writers.

EXCURSUS VII.

Heb. 1: 11, 12. *Σὺ κατ' ἀρχὰς, κύριε, τὴν γῆν ἐθεμελίωσας, καὶ ἔργα τῶν χειρῶν σου εἰσὶν οἱ οὐρανοί. Αὐτοὶ ἀπολοῦνται, σὺ δὲ διαμενεῖς· καὶ πάντες ὡς ἱμάτιον παλαιωθήσονται, καὶ ὡσεὶ περιβόλαιον ἑλίξεις αὐτοὺς, καὶ ἀλλαγήσονται· σὺ δὲ ὁ αὐτὸς εἶ, καὶ τὰ ἔτη σου οὐκ ἐκλείψουσι.*

In regard to the body of the Psalm (Ps. CII.), from which this whole quotation is taken, the majority of late critics agree in the opinion, that it does not *primarily* relate to the Messiah, but to Jehovah absolutely considered. It is, no doubt, one of those Psalms, the internal evidence of which does not so clearly and definitely determine the application of the whole composition, as does that of many others. Thus much, also, seems to be clear; there is nothing in the Psalm, which *forbids* the application of it to the Messiah. Nay, there are several passages in it, which apply to him in a more apposite way, than to any other personage. If we suppose the complaint (vs. 1—11) to be that of the church, previously to the appearance of its Redeemer, then does the sequel well agree with the promised redemption. In particular, verses 15, 18, 20, 22, describe the propagation and prosperity of true religion among the heathen. But when was such a diffusion of the true knowledge and worship of God to take place? Under the Jewish dispensation, or under the Christian? Surely, under the latter only. Comp. too v. 20 with Isaiah 61: 1, which the Saviour applies to himself, Luke 4: 17—21. Verses 23, 24 of Ps. CII., renew the complaint of the church; and vs. 25—28 contain the answer, viz. that the Redeemer is the Creator and immutable, and that the church shall be continued, and a godly seed be permanent. So I am inclined to explain the whole Psalm; and so, at any rate, the writer of our epistle seems to have understood it. Certainly there is nothing that forbids such an explanation, when it is once admitted that the Messiah was at all the subject of prediction, in ancient times, and that some of the Psalms do actually contain such predictions.

But if any one prefers construing Psalm CII. as applicable merely to Jehovah, absolutely considered, then there is no serious difficulty with respect to our quotation. The application of the same words to the Son of God, which were originally spoken respecting Jehovah, is equivalent to saying, 'What was affirmed by the Psalmist of Jehovah, may be as truly affirmed of the Son.' As the writer applies the words in this manner, it shews that he considered those whom he addressed as being accustomed to make such an application of them, and that they were willing to admit it; otherwise he could not have expected the argument to be acknowledged by them as a forcible one.

Admitting now that the apostle has correctly applied this passage to the *Son*, it follows that the Son possesses a nature *truly divine*. The act of creation is the highest evidence of such a nature, that is offered, or can be offered, to our minds; and the sacred writers appeal to it as such. See Rom. 1: 20. Ps. 19: 1. Acts 14: 15. Is. 40: 25, 26. 42: 5—8. 43: 15. 44: 24. 45: 18. 46: 9. 48: 12, 13. The force of the proof in question is not altered, whether you suppose the 102d Psalm *originally* to relate to the Messiah, or not. If it originally related to him, then the application is clear and unembarrassed. If it originally related to Jehovah, simply considered, then the apostle asserts here, that what was said of Jehovah may also be applied, in the same manner, to the Son. Of course, the weight of the argument is the same in either case, as it respects the divine nature of Christ. Either would shew the opinion of the writer to be, that the Son is eternal, and the Creator of the universe; of course, that he is exalted beyond all measure above the angels, and is truly divine. For as the same writer says, *He who made all things, is God*, Heb. 3: 4.

We may observe, too, that this last argument is the climax of the whole, and completes the proof which the apostle adduces to shew the exalted dignity of the Son. He had intimated the same sentiment, at the commencement of his epistle, v. 2; but here he brings out into full light, the nature of his views respecting this subject. Whatever then may be the economy, according to which *God made all things by his Son*, it is *not* of such a nature as to exclude supreme creatorship and eternal existence, as belonging to the Son; both of which are asserted to belong to him by the passage before us.

EXCURSUS VIII.

Heb. 2: 2. *Εἰ γὰρ ὁ δι᾽ ἀγγέλων λαληθεὶς λόγος.*

There are two methods of explaining this. (1) The apostle here speaks merely in the way of *accommodation* to the Jewish mode of representing this subject. The Jews attributed the giving of the law to *angels*, as mediators or *internuncii* between Jehovah and them; and they were accustomed to make high claims, in respect to the dignity and superior excellency of their law, on this account. The apostle here adverts to their views of this subject; and what he says amounts to this, 'If every transgression of the law, which you regard as given by the mediation of angels, was punished, etc.' In like manner, the same apostle says to the Galatians, "Who hath bewitched you?" without intending to teach us that he believed in the power of witchcraft. And so our Saviour speaks to the Jews, of 'the unclean spirit that goes out of a man, and walks through dry [desert] places, seeking rest and finding none, but afterwards it returns with seven other spirits, and repossesses the same man, Matt. 12: 43.' Now as this is not intended to teach us, that impure spirits actually wander about in deserts, etc., so we are not obliged to understand the apostle as meaning any thing more by the expression in question, than a reference to the Jewish mode of speaking and thinking relative to the subject of angels. But

(2) Another mode of explanation is, that the phrase contains a concession, on the part of the writer, of what was viewed *by him* to be matter of *fact*. This view I feel constrained to adopt, by a comparison of similar passages. In Acts 7: 53, Stephen says to the Jews, "ye have received the law *εἰς διαταγὰς ἀγγέλων, by the disposition* [order, arrangement] *of angels;*" and Paul, speaking of the law, in Gal. 3: 19, says, that it was *διαταγεὶς δι᾽ ἀγγέλων, arranged* [disposed, proposed] *by angels*.

But here a difficulty is urged. God *himself* proclaimed the law to the Israelites, Ex. 20: 1, 19, 22. Deut. 5: 4. How then can the law be said to be *λαληθεὶς δι᾽ ἀγγέλων*? Different ways of avoiding and of answering this difficulty, have been adopted. Some have denied that *ὁ λόγος* here means the law; and they interpret it

as referring to the different messages, which in the Old Testament are said to have been delivered by angels. Others have made a distinction between what was said directly to Moses, by God himself, and what was *promulgated* [*διαταγείς, εἰς διαταγάς*], as they say, to the people at large, by angels. That the law of Moses, however, is meant, is plain from a comparison of Heb. 10: 28, 29 and 12: 25; as well as from the nature of the comparison here proposed, between the old dispensation and the new one. And that the tenuious distinction made, in the second case, is unnecessary, every one who reflects well on the *usus loquendi* of Scripture will concede. God is very often said to do that, which instruments under his direction, or under the general arrangements of his providence accomplish. This idiom proceeds so far, that even evil is ascribed to him in this way by one phrase, which another passage shews to have been perpetrated by an inferior agent, E. g. 2 Sam. 24: 7, it is said of Jehovah, וַיָּסֶת *he moved* [or excited] David to go and number Israel; which crime was followed by tremendous punishment. Yet in Chron. 21: 1, it is said of *Satan*, וַיָּסֶת, *he moved* David to go and number Israel. So it is repeatedly said of Pharaoh, that *he hardened his own heart*, and that *the Lord hardened his heart*, in Ex. iv—x. So, according to the prophet, Jehovah smites the confederate Syrians and Israelites, Is. vii—ix; so in other passages, Jehovah is represented as smiting the nations of Judah, of Assyria, of Babylonia, of Egypt, of Tyre, of Moab, etc. Yet, in all these cases, *instruments* were employed. Solomon *built* the temple; but he did not hew and lay the stones with his own hands, nor carve the goodly architecture. Nothing can be more erroneous, then, in most cases, than to draw the conclusion, that because the Scripture asserts some particular thing to have been done by God, therefore he did it *immediately*, and no instruments were employed by him. How much difficulty and contradiction, as well in theology as in interpretation, has such a mode of reasoning produced! In interpreting the principles of human laws, we say, *Qui facit per alium, facit per se.* Does not common sense approve of this, as applied to the language of the Scriptures? Nothing can be more evident, than that the sacred writers have expressed themselves, in a manner which recognizes this principle.

If then we are pressed with the *literal* explanation of *ὁ δι' ἀγγέλων λόγος*, and any one insists, that this can mean no less than

that angels uttered audible sounds, when the law was given; all this may be conceded, and still no contradiction be found in the representations of Scripture, when its *usus loquendi* is well understood. *God did what the angels performed by his direction.*

Yet such a *literal* interpretation of this passage, is hardly to be insisted on. Stephen, in Acts 7: 53, and Paul in Gal. 3: 19, assert only that the law was *διαταγεὶς δι᾽ ἀγγέλων*; which well expresses the general sense to be attached to an expression of this nature, viz. 'the angels were *ministering spirits*, or *assisted* at the giving of the law.' Such was the Jewish tradition, in the apostolic age. Josephus says, "Our best maxims and most excellent laws we have learned of God, *δι᾽ ἀγγέλων*, Archaeol. XV. 9." Philo, (Lib. de Decalogo), states, that "there were present, at the giving of the law, visible sounds, animated and splendid, flames of fire, *πνεύματα*, trumpets, and divine men running hither and thither, to publish the law." Yet in another place he states, that "God only spake the law to Moses;" which, however, as we have seen above, is not inconsistent with the former representation.

In addition to all this, there is a passage in Deut. 33: 2, respecting the legislation at Sinai, which seems to refer to the fact designed to be stated in our text. "The Lord came from Sinai, and rose up from Seir unto them [the children of Israel]; he shined from mount Paran, and *he came with holy myriads*, (מֵרִבְבוֹת קֹדֶשׁ)." By *the holy myriads* here mentioned, must be meant *the angels;* so that the Old and New Testament agree, in representing the angels as present when the law was given, and as being ministering spirits on the occasion.

That the Jews, and a multitude of Christians after them, have carried speculation to a repulsive length, on the subject of *angelic ministration* at the giving of the law, does not disprove the fact itself; much less are their extravagances to be imputed to the writer of our epistle. While some have maintained, that the angels made circuits round the camp of the Hebrews; others, that they excited the thunders, and lightnings, and tempest; some that they blew the trumpets; others that they caused the quaking of the earth; some that they delivered the tables of the law to Moses; others that they uttered audibly the words of the Law; and others still that they were mere spectators of the awful scene; we may stand aloof from being thus wise above what is written, and content ourselves

simply with what our author teaches us, and what the Scriptures confirm, viz. that angels did assist at the giving of the law, or were in some way employed by Jehovah, on the occasion of its being promulgated. This is all the text can be well interpreted as meaning, and all that is requisite for the argument of the apostle.

EXCURSUS IX.

Heb. 2: 6—8. *Διεμαρτύρατο δέ που τις, λέγων, Τί ἐστιν ἄνθρωπος, ὅτι μιμνήσκῃ αὐτόν; Ἠλάττωσας αὐτὸν βραχύ τι παρ᾽ ἀγγέλους· δόξῃ καὶ τιμῇ ἐστεφάνωσας αὐτὸν, (καὶ κατέστησας αὐτὸν ἐπὶ τὰ ἔργα τῶν χειρῶν σου)· πάντα ὑπέταξας ὑποκάτω τῶν ποδῶν αὐτοῦ.*

Thus far the quotation from Ps. VIII. But how, it is asked, can this apply to Christ in particular, when the author of this Psalm evidently speaks of human nature, or man in general? Many of the later commentators reply to this question, by conceding that the apostle uses the words of the Psalm only in an accommodated sense, in order to express his own views of the superiority of Christ's human nature. But this answer does not meet all the demands of the case. It is evident, that the writer appeals to Scripture authority here, in support of the proposition which he had advanced, viz. that the human nature of Christ is superior to that of the angels. If now the passage contains nothing more than an assertion of that dignity, which is common to all men, how would this tend to convince those to whom he wrote, that the human nature of Christ is superior to that of the angels?

It is difficult, then, to avoid the supposition, that the 8th Psalm was referred to the Messiah, by those whom the apostle addressed. Was it rightly referred to him as being prophetic of him, or not? Many commentators answer in the negative. But is there not some reason here, to adhere to the more ancient method of inter-

pretation? Let the reader, now, peruse 2 Sam. vii. through, and then direct his attention to vs. 17—29, in particular to vs. 18, 19, 26, 29, compared with the prophetic declarations of Nathan in vs. 12—16. Does not the frame of mind, in which David appears to have been on this occasion, correspond well with that described in Ps. 8: 5? Suppose now that David, in surveying the works of creation, is, in the first place, deeply impressed with his own insignificance, in a comparative point of view; and then, in the next place, revolves in his mind the promises made to him, as recorded in 2 Sam. vii. His mind is naturally led to dwell on the distinguished goodness of God, in exalting a creature so insignificant as himself, to honour so great as the prophet had promised to him. Among his posterity was to be one, who should be the Son of God, and on whom universal empire should be conferred, 2 Sam. 7: 12—16, compared with vs. 8—11. In view of such honours, how natural would be the expressions in Ps. 8: 6—10. In the person of this illustrious descendant, whom Nathan had promised to him, he could see, with a *prophetic* eye, that the human nature would be exalted to universal dominion. No created thing was to be excepted from this dominion. As to the particulars enumerated in Ps. 8: 8, 9, they are plainly borrowed from Gen. 1: 26 seq. and indicate nothing more than *universality of dominion*. They amount to saying, 'The dominion originally assigned to man over the creation around him, and abridged by his fall, is to be *actually* conferred on human nature; and this too in a still higher sense, inasmuch as all things are to be subjected to the Messiah.' In other words, not only is man to have such dominion as by his original creation he was designed to have, viz. over beasts and fowls and fishes, but nothing, in this case, is to be excepted. With such views as these, might not the royal Psalmist well add, "How excellent is thy name in all the earth!"

Who now that admits the spirit of prophecy to have at all existed, can deny that David might have had such a view of his future Son? Nay, considering the use which the apostle has made of the passage in question, is not this explanation of the Psalm a *probable* one?

I am disposed, then, to believe that the course of thought, in David's mind, was something like the following. 'Lord, how insignificant am I, compared with the glorious works which the heav-

ens display! Yet thou hast magnified thy goodness toward me, in a wonderful manner. Thou hast not only formed me in thine image, and bestowed many blessings upon me, but promised me a Son, on whom distinguished glory, and *universal* empire shall be conferred. Can it be, that human nature will be thus exalted? Adored be thy name through all the earth!'

What is there, now, in all this, which is any more improbable, than any other prophetic declaration respecting a future Saviour and Lord of the world?

But if any one refuses to admit these views, there is still a sense, in which all the saints are, through Christ, to be exalted above angels, and to have a participation in the dominion of the world. They are, as being united with the Messiah, as being his brethren (Heb. 2: 11), to judge, i. e. rule [שָׁפַט, *κρίνειν*] the world, 1 Cor. 6: 2; to rule over the angels, 1 Cor. 6: 3; to have power over the nations, and rule them, Rev. 2: 26, 27; to sit with the Redeemer on his throne, Rev. 3: 21; they are made kings and priests unto God, and reign over the earth, Rev. 5: 10. All this, however, is plainly spoken in a qualified sense; and such privileges are bestowed upon them only by virtue of their union with Christ, to whom supreme dominion belongs. In like manner we say, 'The Romans held the empire of the world;' attributing to the nation what properly belonged to their prince.

Human nature, then, in the persons of the saints; in a special manner, of course, in the person of their head or leader; is exalted to a state of precedence above the angels, to a state of universal dominion. Consequently, that Christ possessed a nature which was human, did not make him inferior to the angels, but (since this nature was to be thus exalted) superior to them. And thus the Psalmist declared it should be.

If the whole passage be understood as limited principally to Christ, or as extending to the saints also, the point which the apostle aims to prove is established. But it is only by understanding the passage according to the first method of interpreting it, that we can well apply, in its full force, the sequel of the apostle's remarks. Indeed, what can be more evident, than that since the fall of our first parents, universal dominion, even over all the animal creation, has never been actually possessed by man? Christ only has it, in its full sense; and in him only have the words of Ps. VIII. had a *πλή-*

φωσις in all the extent of their meaning. When we once admit that prophetic anticipations of Christ were possible, and matters of fact, is there any thing which creates a serious difficulty, in supposing them to have been actually entertained by David in respect to Christ, and to have been uttered in the Psalm just mentioned?

EXCURSUS X.

Heb. 2: 13. *Καὶ πάλιν, Ἐγὼ ἔσομαι πεποιθὼς ἐπ' αὐτῷ· καὶ πάλιν, Ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ, καὶ τὰ παιδία ἃ μοι ἔδωκεν ὁ θεός.*

But how does the passage quoted relate to the Messiah? In Is. 8: 17, 18, the subject spoken of is the prophet himself, who declares that he will keep himself in the attitude of constant waiting, i. e. in expectation that the prophecies which he had just been uttering would be fulfilled; and he appeals to the *children*, to which had been given symbolical names, and which God had given to him, as pledges that these prophecies would be fulfilled. It would seem, then, at first view, that our author had accommodated this passage, merely for the purpose of expressing his views of the subject before him. There can be but little doubt, however, that when our epistle was written, the Jews in general construed a part of the chapter of Isaiah in question, as having respect to the Messiah. Thus Paul, in Rom. 9: 32, 33, seems plainly to refer to Is. 8: 14, as the source of a part of his quotation; and this passage he treats as applicable to Christ. In a similar way, also, the passage under consideration, with the clause that follows, appears to be treated. Indeed, unless the persons to whom Paul wrote, would readily refer the passage quoted to the Messiah, it is difficult to perceive how the quotation, in the shape with which it is here introduced, would present any argument to them in favour of the position, that men are the brethren of the Messiah. But still, the mode of reasoning, it must be owned, seems to be *argumentum ad hominem*, or *argumentum ex concessis*, rather than from the real na-

ture of things, considered independently of the opinions of those to whom our author wrote. Critics, in modern times, have felt a difficulty in considering this species of argument as admissible by a sacred writer. The Christian fathers, however, had no difficulties of this sort; most of them freely admitted it.

The majority of Protestant critics have considered the passage of Isaiah now in question, as actually spoken in the person of the Messiah. This they have done, in order to avoid the necessity of admitting an *argumentum ex concessis*; which has been regarded by them, as incongruous with the character of an inspired writer. But in avoiding one difficulty, they have fallen upon another equally great; for all the laws of exegesis, which bid us to connect text with context, and to interpret a writer so as to make him speak connectedly and directly to his purpose, are put at defiance, when we interpret the words of Is. 8: 17, 18, as *originally* having been spoken with *direct* and *primary* reference to the Messiah, or in his person. To admit such a violation, would be a more serious evil than to concede, with nearly all antiquity, that the apostles did sometimes employ the *argumentum ex concessis*, as in the case above stated.

One may liken this case to that of a missionary in Hindoostan, who, designing to shew the possibility and probability that God might manifest himself in the flesh, should appeal, in the course of his argument, for the sake of silencing objectors, to the Shasters, which inculcate the doctrine that Vishnu became incarnate. Would such an appeal be *morally wrong?* And if not, might not the writer of the epistle to the Hebrews make use of the views of those whom he addressed, respecting a particular passage of Scripture, (although those views might not have been exegetically well grounded), in order to confirm them in the belief of a truth that was well-grounded, and which he knew to be certain, by revelation, or by other Scriptures which had a direct bearing upon it? However one might decide the case by reasoning *a priori*, most men practically admit such methods of persuasion, and, in other things, are very ready to justify them. Whether we are willing, however, or unwilling to admit the fact presented before us, can surely never alter the fact itself. Thus much we may truly say, viz. that those modes of explanation, which, in order to get rid of difficulty, set afloat all the fixed principles and fundamental laws

of interpretation, cannot be admitted without the greatest possible danger to the Scriptures; yet, without the admission of such principles, the words of the passages in question, do not appear susceptible of being construed as *originally* and *primarily* having had a *direct* reference to the Messiah.

After all, this view of the subject applies merely to the simple interpretation of the original *words* of Is. VIII., but not to the typical design which may have been attached to the *things* or *facts* there related. We know that in the preceding chapter, the birth of a child to be called Emmanuel, who was to spring from a virgin, is predicted (7: 14); which birth was to be a proof to Ahaz, that within some three years (comp. vs. 14 with 15, 16), the land of Judah should be delivered from the confederated kings of Israel and Syria, who had invaded it. *Originally* and *literally*, this seems applicable only to the birth of a child within that period of three years; for how could the birth of Jesus, which happened seven hundred and forty two years afterwards, be a sign (אוֹת) to Ahaz, that *within three years* his kingdom was to be freed from his enemies? Such a child, it would seem, was born at that period; for in chapter 8: 8, 10, he is twice referred to as if then present, or at least then living. In v. 10, our English version has translated the proper name עִמָּנוּאֵל, and thus obscured the form of the original Hebrew. Yet in Matt. 1: 23, the passage in Is. 7: 14 appears to be cited, as containing a prophecy relative to the Saviour's being conceived in the womb of the virgin Mary. In what way then must we explain this? How was it a πλήρωσις of Is. 7: 14? To these questions, two answers may be given. (1) It may have been a πλήρωσις, in the same sense as Christ's being called out of Egypt (Matt. 2: 15), was a πλήρωσις of Hosea 11: 1; i. e. the event, which happened in later times, bore a strong resemblance to the one which happened in earlier times; the later event too was of such a nature, that the words of Scripture, applied to characterize the early event, might be applied with a πλήρωσις, i. e. with more *completeness*, with more force, more propriety, more energy, to the later event, than to the earlier one. Just so the application of a passage in the Old Testament, is made to the slaughter of the infants at Bethlehem, in Matt. 2: 17, 18, comp. Jer. 31: 15. In the same manner, many other passages of the New Testament are to be construed, which refer in a similar way to the Old Testament.

But if this answer be unsatisfactory, it may be added, (2) That some of the extraordinary events themselves, related in Is. VII. and VIII., may have been designed by God, and probably were designed by him, to be typical or symbolical of a future spiritual salvation and Saviour. Why is this any more impossible or improbable, than that there were other types and symbols, under the ancient dispensation, of things which were to exist under the new one? The Immanuel then born, in an extraordinary way, and then by his birth and name a pledge of temporal deliverance to Judah from their enemies, might well be a symbol of him who was to save his people from all their spiritual enemies, to bring in everlasting redemption; whose name, also, was truly, in a much higher sense, עִמָּנוּאֵל, GOD WITH US. If so, then the prophet, with his symbolical children (Is. 8: 18), giving assurance of *temporal* deliverance, may have acted a part that was symbolical of a future prophet, who would proclaim *spiritual* deliverance. In all this, there certainly is nothing impossible. The laws of exegesis are not infringed by such a supposition. The *words* of the prophet have but one simple original meaning. They apply directly to the transactions with Ahaz. But the whole of these *transactions* may have been, (may I not add, seem actually to have been?) designed to prefigure a greater prophet, and a greater deliverance. Unless we deny the *possibility* of prophetic symbol, we must admit the *possibility* of this. Its *probability* is deducible from the use which the New Testament writers make of these facts. They seem to consider them as having a relation to Christ. I grant the possibility of the exegesis, which explains the whole as *argumentum ad hominem*. It might be justified by numerous appeals to the New Testament; and he who wholly denies this principle, only shews that he decides upon the subject by reasoning *a priori*; for the examination of *facts* cannot fail to convince any one who will patiently and thoroughly make it. But still, it does seem to me more probable, taking the appeal in Matt. 1: 23 to Is. 7: 14, and the appeal in our text and context to Is. 8: 17, 18, that the prophet and Immanuel here act parts, which may be regarded in the light of *symbols*. The extraordinary birth of the child Immanuel, at that time, is the symbol of the future birth of a spiritual Saviour; and the prophet with his children announcing deliverance from the confederated enemies of Israel, is a symbol of him who was to "preach liberty to the cap-

tives," and whose spiritual children were to be the pledge, that all his promises of good should be fulfilled. Is there any thing unnatural or strange in all this?

If now this be admitted, then the words of our text may not unaptly be applied to Christ. For as the type put his confidence in God, so did the antitype. As the type had children who were pledges for the deliverance of Judah, so has the antitype "many sons and daughters," the pledges of his powerful grace, and sureties that his promises in regard to future blessings will be accomplished. As the type confided in God, because he possessed a nature that was dependent and human, so the antitype must have a like nature in order to use the same language; and as the type bore the relation of parent to children that were pledges of future blessings, and therefore possessed a like nature with them, so the antitype had a community of nature with those who were his spiritual children, and who were pledges that all his promises should be performed. Comp. 2 Cor. 1: 22. 5: 5.

Thus understood, the whole quotation may be regarded not only as justified, but as apposite. Still, if any refuse to consider it in this light, because, as they aver, they are unable to see how the words of Isaiah can be considered in the light of prediction; this reason cannot be regarded as in itself sufficiently valid. The words employed in Is. VII. and VIII. have, in themselves, I freely concede, no direct reference to the Messiah; but to things and events, connected with the affairs of Ahaz and his people. Neither have the words a *double* sense; which can never be conceded without destroying the very basis of all stable interpretation. Yet the *events* themselves, *events* connected with the *temporal deliverance* of God's people then, may be symbols of a subsequent and *spiritual deliverance* and *deliverer*.

But if any one refuses to admit even thus much, it will be difficult for him to shew, that the writer of this epistle might not use *argumentum ex concessis* here, (i. e. appeal to those views of Scripture, which they whom he addressed entertained), in order to confirm in them a belief of what he certainly knew to be true; as well as the Saviour could appeal to the Jewish belief, respecting the wandering of unclean spirits in desert places, and many of them taking possession of a man at one and the same time, Matt. 12: 43 seq.; or as well as the Saviour could say to the Jews, "If I by Beelze-

but cast out demons, by whom do your sons cast them out? Luke 11: 19." The difficulty is, in fact, no greater with the quotation under examination, than with many others in the New Testament. Understood in any of the ways that have been proposed, it forms no important objection against the sacred writings, or their divine authority; although considered in the light of *accommodation* simply, it would interfere with some of the modern theories of inspiration. But, as has already been stated, the ancient churches, high as their views were on the subject of inspiration, had no hesitancy, in general, to admit the principle, that the New Testament writers have, not unfrequently, applied the Old Testament Scriptures merely by way of *accommodation*. While then, for myself, I must believe there is something more than accommodation, in the passage under consideration, yet I should not feel it to be a just cause for want of charity towards another, who should adopt a different mode of explanation, and regard the passages cited to be merely an *argumentum ex concessis*.

It is a strong ground of confirmation, with respect to the symbolical exegesis which has been above proposed, that the prophecy in Isaiah, (which begins with the 8th chapter and ends with chap. 9: 7), contains, at the close of it, most indubitable proofs, that the birth of the Messiah, and the "coming of his kingdom" was, on this occasion, distinctly before the mind of the prophet; see Is. 9: 1—7. The whole together, taken in connexion with what appears evidently to be the views of the New Testament writers, seems to leave but little doubt, that such as at all acknowledge the existence of prophecy and symbol, in respect to a Messiah who was to come, may recognise them both in the case before us.

EXCURSUS XI.

Heb. 5: 7. *Ὃς ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ, δεήσεις τε καὶ ἱκετηρίας πρὸς τὸν δυνάμενον σώζειν αὐτὸν ἐκ θανάτου, μετὰ κραυγῆς ἰσχυρᾶς καὶ δακρύων προσενέγκας, καὶ εἰσακουσθεὶς ἀπο τῆς εὐλαβείας.*

But what was that which Christ feared? And how can it be said, that he was delivered from it? Questions which commentators, for the most part have passed by, even without any serious attempt to answer them.

If now we turn to Luke 12: 50, we shall see that a view of sufferings then future, produced in the mind of Jesus an oppressive anticipation, a sensation of distress and dread. As the scene of crucifixion approached nearer, these sensations were evidently increased, until they became almost overwhelming; as we may see by consulting Matt. 26: 36—39. Luke 22: 40—44. Mark 14: 34—36. What the agonies of the cross which Jesus endured, actually were, we can never fully know; but we may draw the conclusion that they were very dreadful, if we read the account of the complaint which they forced from him, as it is recorded in Matt. 27: 46. Mark 15: 34. It is indeed unaccountable, that a character such as that of Jesus, pure, spotless, firm, unmoved by opposition and contumely and persecution, and unawed by threatenings and danger, during the whole course of his public ministry, should exhibit such a despondency, such an oppressive, overwhelming sense of pain and distress: I mean, it is unaccountable by any of the ordinary principles which apply to virtuous sufferers, who possess fortitude of soul. That Jesus possessed this quality, in a most distinguished manner, we know certainly from the whole tenor of his life as pourtrayed by the evangelists. How then could he exhibit such an oppressive, overwhelming sense of dread, at the prospect of crucifixion? Thousands of men, nay thousands of the more delicate sex, in prospect of like sufferings or apparently greater ones, (such as the rack, the wheel, or flames occasion), have been perfectly calm, collected, and even triumphant. The very thieves, on the cross at the same time

with Jesus, exhibit no such signs of despondency and oppression. Thousands and millions of common men, without God and without hope in the world, have undergone sufferings greater than those of simple crucifixion, without even uttering a groan. Yet Jesus was not only supported by a consciousness of spotless innocence, but had before him the certain prospect of a speedy resurrection from the dead, of exaltation to the right hand of God, and of being a king and high priest forever, unto all his people. Still, he was in such an agony at the prospect of the cross, as to sweat as it were drops of blood, Luke 22: 44. And when actually enduring the suffering which he had anticipated, his exclamation, Matt. 27: 46, shews that he had not over-estimated the dreadful hour.

If Jesus died as a common virtuous sufferer, and merely as a martyr to the truth, without any *vicarious* suffering laid upon him, then is his death a most unaccountable event, in respect to the manner of his behaviour while suffering it; and it must be admitted, that multitudes of humble, sinful, weak, and very imperfect disciples of Christianity, have surpassed their Master, in the fortitude, and collected firmness, and calm complacency, which are requisite to triumph over the pangs of a dying hour. But who can well believe this? Or who can regard Jesus as a simple sufferer in the ordinary way, upon the cross, and explain the mysteries of his dreadful horror, before and during the hours of crucifixion?

Such then was the *εὐλάβεια*, מוֹרָא, *object of dread*, to which our text adverts. But how was Jesus *εἰσακουσθείς, delivered from it?* Pierce, in his commentary, says, that he was delivered by being raised from the dead and advanced to glory. But this would make the object of fear or dread to be, that he should remain in the state of the dead. This fear we can hardly suppose Jesus to have entertained, inasmuch as he had often foretold, to his disciples, not only his death, but his resurrection and exaltation to glory. Nor could it be the sufferings of the cross that he was delivered from, for he endured them to a dreadful degree. What then was it, in respect to which he was *εἰσακουσθείς, heard*, or *delivered?* The context necessarily limits the *hearing* or *deliverance*, to something in his petitions which appertained to *suffering*, which was an object of *dread*. What could it be, but the dread of sinking under the agony of being deserted by his Father? Matt. 27: 46. Great as his agony was, he never refused to bear it; nor did he

shrink from tasting the bitter cup, Luke 22: 42. Matt. 26: 39. And does not Luke 22: 43 explain our *εἰσακουσθεὶς ἀπὸ εὐλαβείας*? "There appeared unto him an angel from heaven *strengthening him, ἐνισχύων αὐτόν*." This was the only kind of deliverance he sought for, or on the whole desired; Luke 22: 42, *πλὴν μὴ τὸ θέλημά μου ἀλλὰ τὸ σὸν γενέσθω*. The dread in question was, like all his other sufferings, incident to his human nature; and fact shews, that he suffered under it to a high degree; but he did not shrink from it, and so he was *heard* or *delivered* in respect to the object of his petition in regard to it.

In the explanation of a passage so difficult, confidence would be unbecoming. I can only say, If this be not the right interpretation of it, I am ignorant of its true meaning, and will most thankfully receive from any one a more probable interpretation.

EXCURSUS XII.

Heb. 6: 4—6. *Ἀδύνατον γὰρ τοὺς ἅπαξ φωτισθέντας, γευσαμένους τε τῆς δωρεᾶς ἐπουρανίου καὶ μετόχους γενηθέντας πνεύματος ἁγίου, καὶ καλὸν γευσαμένους θεοῦ ῥῆμα, δυνάμεις τε μέλλοντος αἰῶνος, καὶ παραπεσόντας, πάλιν ἀνακαινίζειν εἰς μετάνοιαν.*

But does the whole paragraph pertain to real Christians, or to those who are such only by profession? To the former, beyond all reasonable doubt. For how could the apostle so solemnly warn those who were *mere professors* of Christianity, against defection, and apostasy? Defection from what? From a graceless condition, and from a state of hypocrisy. Such must be the answer, if mere professors, and not possessors, of Christianity be addressed. But mere professors, instead of being cautioned against defection from the state in which they are, are every where denounced in language of the severest reprobation. See Rev. 3: 15, 16, and the denunciations of the Saviour against the Pharisees.

Moreover the language employed to describe the condition of the persons in question, shews that the writer is addressing those whom he takes to be real Christians. E. g. *μετόχους πνεύματος ἁγίου, καλὸν γευσαμένους θεοῦ ῥῆμα.* Above all, *πάλιν ἀναιανίζειν εἰς μετάνοιαν*; for how could he speak of being AGAIN *renewed by repentance*, if he did not address them as once having been renewed by it?

The nature of the crime, too, and the awful denunciation with which it is threatened, shews that something *peculiar* is attached to the case which the writer is describing. Sinners, who have been taught the doctrines of religion, and yet renounce their *external* respect for it, are manifestly not without the pale of God's mercy; at least, they are not so considered in the Scriptures generally, and fact shews that they are not. It is a peculiar and aggravated case, then, which is here stated; and what other case can it be, than that of apostasy from a state of *saving* knowledge of Christ and his gospel? Nor is such a case at all without a parallel in the Scriptures. Manifestly such an one is stated in Heb. 10: 26—32; also in 2 Pet. 2: 20—22; in Ezek. 18: 24. 33: 12, 13. 3: 20, and in many other passages of the Bible. It is implied in every warning, and in every commination addressed to the righteous; and surely the Bible is filled with both of these, from the beginning to the end. What is implied, when our Saviour, in his Sermon on the mount, urges upon his disciples, i. e. the apostles as well as other disciples (see Luke 6: 12—20), the duty of cutting off a right hand, and of plucking out a right eye that offends; and this, on penalty of being cast into hell? Matt. 25: 29, 30. Is this penalty *really* threatened; or is it only a *pretence* of threatening, something spoken merely *in terrorem?* Can we hesitate, as to the answer which must be given to this question?

But if we admit the penalty to be really threatened, then the implication is the same as in the passage before us, viz. that Christians are addressed as exposed to incur the penalty of the divine law by sinning. In our text, they are surely addressed as exposed to fall into a state, in which there is no hope of a renewal by repentance. Whatever may be true, in the divine purposes, as to the final salvation of all those who are once truly regenerated, (and this doctrine I feel constrained to admit), yet nothing can be plainer, than that the sacred writers have every where addressed saints in

the same manner as they would address those, whom they considered as constantly exposed to fall away, and to perish forever. It cannot be denied, that all the warnings and awful comminations, (directed against cases of defection), are addressed to Christians, in the New Testament, which could be addressed to them, supposing them to be liable, every hour, to sin beyond the hope of being renewed by repentance. Whatever *theory* may be adopted, in explanation of this subject, as a matter of *fact* there can be no doubt, that Christians are to be solemnly and earnestly warned against the danger of apostasy and consequent final perdition. What else is the object of the whole epistle to the Hebrews, except a warning against apostasy? In this all agree. But this involves all the difficulties that can be raised by metaphysical reasonings, in regard to the perseverance of the saints. For why should the apostle warn true Christians, (and such he surely believed there were among the Hebrews, 6: 9), against defection and perdition? My answer would be, Because God treats Christians as free agents, as rational beings; because he guards them against defection, not by mere *physical* power, but by *moral* means adapted to their natures, as free and rational agents. Let every man speculate as he pleases on this subject, when he addresses Christians by way of warning, he will inevitably fall into the same modes of address. And plainly he ought so to do; for thus have all the sacred writers done, and thus did the Saviour himself.

EXCURSUS XIII.

Heb. 7: 3. *Ἀπάτωρ, ἀμήτωρ, ἀγενεαλόγητος, μήτε ἀρχὴν ἡμέρων μήτε ζωῆς τέλος ἔχων, ἀφωμοιωμένος δὲ τῷ υἱῷ τοῦ θεοῦ, μένει ἱερεὺς εἰς τὸ διηνεκές.*

The description of Melchisedek, in v. 3, has been interpreted in a variety of ways, so as to give rise to many diverse opinions, respecting the person introduced here by this name. I shall very briefly exhibit some of them, without delaying to examine them.

(1) The Hieracitae, (so called from Hierax, Epiphan. Haeres. LXVII.), held Melchisedek to be the Holy Spirit. Jerome undertakes to confute them, Epist. ad Evagrium.

(2) The Melchisedeciani, (the author of which sect was Theodotus, or Thomas), held Melchisedek to be one of the δυνάμεις of God, emanated from him, superior to Christ, and after the model of which Christ was formed.

(3) It is an ancient opinion, (as Epiph. Haeres. LXVII. testifies), that Melchisedek was the Son of God, i. e. the Logos; the same who appeared to Abraham, and to the patriarchs, etc. This opinion was held by Ambrose; and it has been defended in recent times, by Molinaeus, Cunaeus, Gaillard, Outrein, Hottinger, Stark, Petersen, and others.

(4) Origen, and after him Didymus, held Melchisedek to be an angel.

(5) Others have held that Melchisedek was a man formed before the creation, out of spiritual and not of earthly matter.

(6) Melchisedek was Enoch, sent again to live on earth, after the flood. So Hen. Hulsius.

(7) Melchisedek was Shem, the son of Noah. So Targum Jon. and Jerus.; so also Lyranus, Tostatus, Eugubinus, Cajetan, Genebrard, Torniello, Villalpandus, of the Catholic Church; and among Pretestants, Peucer, Pelargus, Brughton, Melancthon, Rungius, and others.

(8) Melchisedek was Job. So G. Kohlreis.

(9) It is unknown who he was. So Lyser, Gesner, Baldwin, Crenius, Buddaeus, and others.

(10) Melchisedek was a righteous and peaceful king, a worshipper and priest of the most high God, in the land of Canaan; a friend of Abraham, and of a rank elevated above him.

This last opinion lies upon the face of the sacred record, in Gen. XIV., and in Heb. VII.; and it is the only one which can be defended on any tolerable grounds of interpretation. What can be more improbable, than all the opinions above mentioned, with the exception of this? The most popular opinion among them all, viz. that Melchisedek was Christ, would of course force us to adopt this interpretation, viz. that 'Christ is like unto himself;' or, that a comparison is formally instituted by our author, *between Christ and himself*;—"cujus mentio est refutatio."

EXCURSUS XIV.

Heb. 7: 9, 10. *Καὶ, ὡς ἔπος εἰπεῖν, διὰ Ἀβραὰμ καὶ Λευΐ, ὁ δεκάτας λαμβάνων, δεδεκάτωται· ἔτι γὰρ ἐν τῇ ὀσφύϊ τοῦ πατρὸς ἦν, ὅτε συνήντησεν αὐτῷ ὁ Μελχισεδέκ.*

For a Hebrew, this assertion would less need an *ὡς ἔπος εἰπεῖν*, than for us, whose modes of thinking and reasoning in regard to genealogies, descent, and rank, are so very different from those of the oriental nations. Since Abraham was deemed, by his posterity, to be the patriarch and head of all his descendants, in such a sense as to hold a pre-eminence in rank above them, a proof that he acknowledged his inferiority to Melchisedek, by paying tithes to him, was a proof that his descendants must of course be inferior to Melchisedek. The statement in vs. 9 and 10, is built upon the oriental modes of estimating descent and rank. Since Levi, who was of the posterity of Abraham, might be reckoned as then virtually in the patriarch; and, since he descended from him, and therefore could not be regarded as of a rank above him; it would follow, according to the Jewish mode of reasoning, that the priesthood of Melchisedek was of a rank superior to that of Levi.

If it be said, "We do not need such considerations as these, to establish the superior priesthood of Christ; neither do we, in this manner, count upon genealogy, and descent, and rank;" I freely assent. But then I am not able to see, why this should at all detract from the propriety or the weight of the epistle to the Hebrews, viz. that the writer has fully met the exigencies of the case, which called forth the epistle itself; and met them in just such a way as was adapted to the condition of his readers, and the modes of reasoning to which they were accustomed. If they attached high importance and dignity to the Levitical priesthood, because the Levites descended from Abraham, (as they surely did), and this opinion served to fill their minds with difficulty in regard to admitting, that the priesthood of Christ could supersede that of Aaron; then

was it directly to the writer's purpose, to remove this prejudice, and to shew them, that according to their own grounds of argument and computation, Melchisedek must be superior to the Levitical priests, and to Abraham himself. If now in doing this, (which all must admit was necessary and proper to be done), the writer has met their prejudices with arguments specially adapted to this purpose, and the force of which they must acknowledge, if true to their own principles; and, at the same time, he has averred nothing which is adapted to inculcate error, or to mislead others who were educated in a different manner from the Hebrews; then has he done what every wise and prudent man ought to do, under circumstances like his. And if several of his arguments are not now needed by us, and cannot well be employed by us, at the present time, with any particular efficacy, this makes nothing against his discretion, or against the validity of his reasoning. We all enjoy the light which has been shed around us by the whole of the New Testament. Of this the Hebrews had little or nothing. We are educated with views and feelings entirely *different*, *in* many respects, from those in which they were brought up. We do not, therefore, need to be addressed and reasoned with, in *all* respects just as they did. Many of their prejudices, we have not; many of their doubts with respect to the superiority of Christianity over the Mosaic religion, we never entertained. Many things, then, which were said with great force and propriety to them, by our author, cannot be addressed to us with the *same* pertinency, nor felt with the same power.

Let the reasoning in the epistle to the Hebrews be judged of equitably, by taking into view such considerations as these, and all difficulties of any serious import, will, as I am inclined to believe, be removed from the mind of a serious, candid, and intelligent reader. Such considerations, too, might have saved the many *inuendos*, (with which we meet, in not a few of the recent commentaries on our epistle), that the writer has built nearly all his arguments upon *allegory* and *accommodation*; an accommodation which allows the whole force of all the erroneous methods of Jewish reasoning, and conforms to it, merely in order to prevent the apostasy of professed Christians. I cannot acquiesce in the *latitude* of this opinion; nor can I well admit, that a sacred writer would make use of an argument, which in its nature he knows to be wholly er-

roneous and destitute of force, for the sake of persuading men to embrace Christianity, or to continue in the profession of it. Would not this be "doing evil, that good might come?" But I feel no objection to admitting, that *argumentum ad hominem* may be employed, for the sake of confuting errorists, and exposing their inconsistency. The Saviour himself plainly resorts to this, in some cases; see Matt. 12: 27. Luke 11: 19. So in our epistle, it cannot be deemed irrelevant or improper, if the writer shews the Jews, that from their own modes of counting descent, and reckoning precedence in regard to rank, Melchisedek, (and consequently Jesus), was as a priest of an order superior to the Levites. For substance this is done, in the chapter under examination. Yet there is nothing conceded here, which can in any way endanger the principles of truth. At the same time, after the explanations that have been made, it is hazarding nothing to say, that we now have more convincing arguments than those here used, to establish the superiority of Christ's priesthood. But, let it be remembered, we owe them to the New Testament which we have in our hands, and which the Hebrews had not. Many things, therefore, needed by them in their condition, and with the greatest propriety urged upon them, are less applicable and less important to us, merely because our circumstances differ so much from theirs.

If the reader wants confirmation, in regard to the statement above made, of the Jewish views respecting the *precedency* of Abraham, let him peruse Matt. 3: 9. John 8: 52—58. Luke 16: 22—25.

EXCURSUS XV.

Heb. 8: 5. *Ὅρα γάρ, φησί, ποιήσῃς πάντα κατὰ τὸν τύπον τὸν δειχθέντα σοι ἐν τῷ ὄρει.*

It has been asked, In what way was this τύπος exhibited to Moses? Was it by ocular vision; or by suggestion to the mind; or by words communicated to Moses, descriptive of the form in

which the tabernacle should be constructed? The answer to all such questions is very easy; viz. that the subject is beyond the boundaries of human knowledge, so that we can know nothing more respecting it, than what Moses himself has told us. But this is merely an assertion of the *fact*, that the τύπος was exhibited to him. He says nothing at all, of the *manner* in which it was exhibited. Consequently, the *fact* is all that we can know; and surely it is all that we need to know; for of what importance to us can the *manner* be, in which this revelation was made? The passage in Acts 7: 44, which speaks of the τύπον that Moses ἑωράκει, determines nothing, as it is not said whether he *saw* in a bodily or mental manner; and the word ἑωράκει is plainly applicable to either. In 1 Chron. 28: 19, David, after having drawn a plan for the temple says, *All, which is in the writing from the hand of the Lord*, i. e. made by divine assistance; הִשְׂכִּיל, *he taught me, even all the work* הַתַּבְנִית, τύπου, i. e. of the plan. Yet here was no ocular disclosure. Consequently, the words used in our text will not determine the *manner* of the communication to Moses; and therefore we are not to consider it as capable of being definitely determined.

It follows, of course, that the exhibition of a visible temple in heaven, to the view of Moses, of a temple having *form* and *locality*, cannot be assumed; unless we build upon that which has no foundation to support it. The most that we can know of this subject is, that on mount Sinai, the Lord revealed to Moses the τύπον of the tabernacle which he was to build; and that this is merely a ὑπόδειγμα and σκιά of the heavenly one. Is it a ὑπόδειγμα then in a *material* sense, or in a *spiritual, moral* one? In the latter, without any reasonable doubt; for so the whole nature of the argument leads us to conclude. The apostle is not comparing one *material* tabernacle on earth, with another more magnificent one of the same kind in heaven; but a material earthly one, with one which the Lord made, which is οὐ χειροποίητος, and οὐ ταύτης τῆς κτίσεως, 9: 11, i. e. which is spiritual and heavenly in its nature. The whole representation, then, comes to this; 'In heaven are truly and really all those things, which the Jewish tabernacle and temple, with all their rites and offerings, only adumbrated. What is *there*, is *reality* in the highest and noblest sense; what is *here*, is comparatively only *shadow* and *effigy*. Christ does really there, what the high-priest has been accustomed to do figuratively

and symbolically here. The temple *here* faintly represents, (is ὑπόδειγμα and σκιά of), real *spiritual* existences and occurrences *there*.'

The very nature of the heavenly world, and of the apostle's argument, is sufficient to shew, that this is all which can be rationally deduced from the language which he employs. It would be just as rational to maintain, that God has a local habitation, and a corporeal form visible to the eye, because the Scriptures speak of his *fixed dwelling place* in heaven (מְעוֹנָה), and of his hands and eyes and face and heart, as it would be to suppose that the temple above, in which Christ ministers, possesses *form*, and is composed of *material substance*, like that which was built by the Jews. *This* was merely σκιά; *that* is ἀλήθεια, ὑπόστασις, i. e. of heavenly, spiritual, divine ὑπόστασις, not earthly, visible, local matter.

How to build the *earthly* tabernacle, Moses was instructed on the mount. But whether a form of the same was presented to his vision, bodily or mental; or whether he was taught by words, what the τύπος should be, does not, (as we have seen), appear from Scripture; nor is it important for us to know. Enough to know, that the earthly tabernacle is related to the heavenly one, only as *shadow to substance*; and consequently that our great high priest above, is exalted to a rank unspeakably higher than that of the Jewish high priest.

All which Moses and the people of Israel saw upon mount Sinai, the darkness and smoke, the fire, the cloud, and the lightnings; the voice of the trumpet which they heard, and the quaking of the earth which they felt, (Ex. 19: 17—20 20: 18—21. 24: 1, 2, 9, 10, 15—18. Heb. 12: 18—21); were manifestly symbols merely of the divine presence, adapted to inspire the people with reverence and awe. In the same manner, the תַּבְנִית or τύπος of the tabernacle to be built, was a symbol of what is heavenly or divine. It may just as well be argued from the clouds, and darkness, and fire, and lightning, and thunder, and earthquake of Sinai, that all these belong *materially* and *formally* to the heavenly world, as that the τύπος exhibited to Moses, was an actually *visible, material* part of heaven.

If now the tabernacle built by Moses, the greatest of all the Jewish prophets, Heb. 3: 2, was nothing more than an ἀντίτυπος of that in heaven, Heb. 9: 23, 24, a mere σκιά of it, 8: 5; then the

temple built by Solomon, which was only an imitation of this, 1 K. 8: 10—19. 1 Chron. 28: 19; and that in aftertimes, built by Zorobabel, Ez. 5: 1 seq., and which was less magnificent, Ez. 3: 12, 13; must also be merely *ἀντίτυποι* and *σκιαί* of that temple, of which Jesus is the priest. Consequently, the greater dignity of his priestly office may be obviously inferred, from this comparison.

EXCURSUS XVI.

Heb. 9: 4. *Χρυσοῦν ἔχουσα θυμιατήριον.*

There is great difficulty and much perplexity among commentators, in regard to the *θυμιατήριον* here mentioned. Moses makes no mention of such a sacred utensil, as appertaining to the most holy place; neither does the description of Solomon's temple, (modelled after the tabernacle), contain any information respecting it. *Θυμιατήριον*, in its general sense, indicates any thing which contains *θυμίαμα* or *incense;* so that it may be applied either to an altar of incense, or to any pot or vessel, adapted for offering incense by burning it. Josephus applies *θυμιατήριον* to the *altar of incense*, Antiq. III. 6, 8; and so some have applied the word, in the phrase under consideration. But it is a strong, if not conclusive objection to this, that the altar of incense was *before* the vail of the most holy place, and not *within* it, Ex. 30: 1—6. 40: 5, 26. Moreover this altar is called, in Hebrew, מִזְבַּח הַקְּטֹרֶת, Ex. 37: 25. 2 Chron. 26: 19, 16; מִזְבַּח, Ex. 40: 5; or, מִזְבַּח מִקְטַר קְטֹרֶת, Ex. 30: 1. In Greek, it is named *θυσιαστήριον*, and *θυσιαστήριον θυμιάματος*. On this altar, moreover, daily offerings of incense were to be made, both morning and evening, Ex. 30: 1—8. The *horns* of it, once in each year, were to be sprinkled with blood, viz. on the great day of atonement, Ex. 30: 10. But I am unable to find any place, which declares that this altar was carried within the vail, on the day just named, by the priest who offered incense before the Lord. On the contrary, the incense of-

fered on that day, was strewed on a vessel of burning coals, or a censer, i. e. pan or fire pan, which the priest held in his hand, and carried with him into the most holy place, Lev. 16: 12—14. The name of the vessel was מַחְתָּה, Lev. 16: 12. Ex. 27: 3. 38: 3. 1 K. 7: 50. 2 Chron. 4: 22. In 2 Chron. 26: 19, this vessel is named מִקְטֶרֶת, and again in Ezek. 8: 11; in both which places the Septuagint have *θυμιατήριον*. Now nothing can be plainer, than that the מַחְתָּה and מִקְטֶרֶת were different from the *altar of incense*, מִזְבַּח הַקְּטֹרֶת. Upon this, on the morning and evening of every day, offerings of incense were made; and this altar *stood* before the vail, Ex. 30: 6—8. On the day of atonement, also, the *horns* of it were to be sprinkled with blood, Ex. 30: 10. 40: 5, 26. But the incense before the Lord, which was to be offered in the inner sanctuary, was offered upon a מַחְתָּה, *pan* of burning coals, Lev. 16: 12. Uzziah was about to burn incense in this manner, when the priests withstood him, 2 Chron. 26. 16—19. Comp. also the case of Nadab and Abihu, Lev. 10: 1.

That the incense altar was *stationary*, is plain from the dimensions assigned to it in Ex. 30: 1, 2, viz. a cubit (i. e. $1\frac{1}{2}$ foot) long and broad, and two cubits in height. The removal of this by the high priest, into the most holy place, is out of question, when we consider that it was made of solid materials, probably metal of some kind. But the censers (fire pans) were hand-utensils, constructed for the very purpose of taking coals from the altar of burnt offering, (where the fire was never suffered to become extinguished), for the various uses of the temple, Lev. 16: 12. The whole difficulty then, in our verse, amounts to this, viz. whether the *χρυσοῦν θυμιατήριον*, here mentioned, was laid up or deposited in the most holy place. That there were several *θυμιατήρια* or מַחְתּוֹת, is certain from Ex. 27: 3. 38: 3. That the מַחְתָּה or *θυμιατήριον*, which was employed by the high priest, was *χρυσοῦν* i. e. *gilded*, or (if you will) *golden*, is highly probable; indeed, one would suppose quite certain, seeing that the altar of incense, (which was designed only for the every day's offering of incense), was to be overlaid with pure gold, Ex. 30: 3. Much more, may we well suppose, that the censer, (carried by the high priest into the *ἅγια ἁγίων*, on the most solemn of all days, viz. the day of atonement for the whole nation), was covered with gold, i. e. was *χρυσοῦν*, as the apostle calls it. Moses, indeed, has not given us any particular descrip-

tion of such a censer; nor is it mentioned particularly in the description of Solomon's temple; nor is it any where said in the Old Testament, that such a censer was laid up in the most holy place. But as nothing can be more probable, than that the censer was *χρυσοῦν*; so nothing can be more probable than that it was deposited in the inner sanctuary. That a censer used for the most sacred of all the temple rites, on a day the most solemn of all the Jewish festival days, should be used for the common and every day occasions of temple service, is highly improbable; especially when we consider that every thing pertaining to the service of the *inner sanctuary*, was regarded in a light that corresponded with the designation of that place, viz. *ἁγια ἁγίων*, or קֹדֶשׁ קָדָשִׁים.

Besides, the writer of our epistle, so intimately acquainted with every thing that pertained to the temple, to its rites, and indeed to the whole Jewish economy, cannot be reasonably supposed to have mistaken the fact, relative to the materials of which the censer used on the great day of expiation was made, or to the place where it was deposited. How easily would those whom he addressed have detected his error, and been led, of course, to think lightly of his accuracy, when matters so obvious escaped his notice! In short, all the objection against the account of our author is, that the Old Testament is silent in regard to the two particulars about the censer which he mentions, viz. that it was *χρυσοῦν*, and that it was deposited in the *ἁγια ἁγίων*. But surely *silence*, in such a case, is no *contradiction*; and the nature of the whole case is such, there can be no rational doubt, that our author has made a correct statement. The want of correctness here would have argued an ignorance on his part, which would have destroyed all his credit with those whom he addressed.

If an apology be needed for dwelling so long on this subject, any one may find it by consulting the commentators, and learning the difficulties which have been made about it, and the charges of inaccuracy, or failure of memory, which have been made against the writer of our epistle, on account of the clause *χρυσοῦν ἔχουσα θυμιατήριον*.

EXCURSUS XVII.

Heb. 9: 4. *Ἐν ᾗ, στάμνος χρυσῆ ἔχουσα τὸ μάννα, καὶ ἡ ῥάβδος Ἀαρὼν ἡ βλαστήσασα, καὶ αἱ πλάκες τῆς διαθήκης.*

But there is another difficulty, in regard to the phrase under consideration. It is said, 1 K. 8: 9 and 2 Chron. 5: 10, that "there was nothing in the ark, save the two tables which Moses put therein at Horeb." This, no doubt, is true; but our author is speaking, in Heb. 9: 4, of the *tabernacle* as constructed and furnished by Moses, and not of the temple built some five hundred years afterwards; still less, of the second temple, which, after the burning of the first by Nebuchadnezzar, must have lacked even *the tables of the testimony* or law. These were probably destroyed, at the time when the first temple was consumed; since we have no authentic intelligence respecting them afterwards. It is probable, too, that the first temple lacked both the *pot of manna*, and the *rod of Aaron*; at least we have no account of their being deposited in it. The probability is, that the ark, during its many removals by the Israelites after it was constructed, and in particular during its captivity by the Philistines, 1 Sam. 4: 11. 5: 1. 6: 1, 21, was deprived of these sacred deposits; for we hear no more concerning them. Be this as it may, our author is fully justified, when, in describing the tabernacle, he attributes to it what the Pentateuch does; and that the *pot of manna* and *Aaron's rod* were laid up in the most holy place, and in the *ark of the covenant*, may be seen in Ex. 16: 32—34. Num. 17: 10 (17: 25). In both these passages, the Hebrew runs thus; *Laid up* לִפְנֵי הָעֵדוּת, *before the testimony*, i. e. either before the ark containing the testimony; or (which is altogether more probable), *before the testimony itself*, i. e. the two tables which were in the ark. Consequently, they were laid up with the testimony, i. e. the two tables; and the account given by our author is strictly correct.

It will be recollected, too, that it is the tabernacle made by Moses, that he is describing throughout. As this was patterned after

that which Moses "had seen upon the mount," and was built by workmen who had particular divine assistance Ex. 36: 1, it was, of course, regarded by the Jews as the most perfect structure of all that had been erected for the worship of God. Perfect as it was, however, the apostle labours to shew, that it was a mere shadow or image of the heavenly tabernacle, in which Jesus ministers.

EXCURSUS XVIII.

Heb. 9: 14. *Ὃς διὰ πνεύματος αἰωνίου ἑαυτὸν προσήνεγκεν ἄμωμον τῷ θεῷ.*

Διὰ πνεύματος αἰωνίου is a difficult phrase, about the meaning of which a great variety of opinions have been formed. Some understand it of the Holy Spirit; and some manuscripts and versions read *ἁγίου* instead of *αἰωνίου*. But in what respect the Holy Spirit rendered the offering of Christ perfect (*ἄμωμον*), it would be difficult to shew from other parts of the Scriptures; which contain, so far as I have been able to discover, no assertions of a doctrine analogous to this. Others, as Ernesti, Capell, Outrein, Wolf, Cramer, Carpzoff, etc., understand it of the *divine* nature of Christ. But although the offering of Christ might be rendered of the highest value, on account of the dignity of his person, in consequence of the higher nature which dwelt in him; yet the sacred writers represent him as having made atonement in his *human* nature, not in his divine. Heb. 2: 14, 17, 18. Col. 1: 21, 22. Phil. 2: 6—8. Heb. 10: 5, 10. 1 Pet. 2: 24. But, independently of this consideration, instances are wanting satisfactorily to prove, that *πνεῦμα ἅγιον* or *αἰώνιον*, when applied to Christ, designates *simply his divine nature, as such.*

Others consider *πνεῦμα αἰώνιον* as designating the idea of a *victim*, the sacrifice of which had *perpetual* efficacy to procure the pardon of sin; which is the ground of the epithet, *αἰώνιον*. Thus Noesselt, in his essay on this passage contained in his *Opuscula*. But in this case, no *usus loquendi* can be alleged, to justify such an interpretation.

Others, as Heinrichs, Schleusner, Rosenmüller, Koppe, Jaspis, etc. consider *πνεῦμα αἰώνιον* as *endless* or *immortal* life, comparing it with 7: 16. They place this in antithesis to the perishable nature of the beasts that were slain in sacrifice, and which are mentioned in the preceding verse. The antithesis would then be thus; 'If mere *perishable brutes*, slain in sacrifice, effected external sanctification; how much more shall the offering of Christ, endowed with *eternal* life, or, with an *immortal* spirit, purify the conscience, etc.' To this view of the subject I was myself inclined, before I made a special investigation of the word *πνεῦμα*, as applied to Christ. In doing this, I found, beside the present instance, two other cases, in which it is pretty evidently applied to designate his *glorified state*, in the world of spirits, in distinction from his state of incarnation and humiliation. Thus Rom. 1: 3, 4, *κατὰ πνεῦμα ἁγιωσύνης* designates a state of distinction from *κατὰ σαρκά*, the *human nature* of Christ, that was descended from David; *ἐκ σπέρματος Δαβὶδ, κατὰ σάρκα υἱοῦ θεοῦ ἐν δυνάμει, κατὰ πνεῦμα. Κατὰ πνεῦμα ἁγιωσύνης* here designates the condition, in which Christ was the exalted and *powerful Son of God*, *υἱοὺ θεοῦ ἐν δυνάμει*, comp. Phil. 2: 8, 9. Heb. 2: 9, 10; i. e. it is descriptive of that *spiritual majesty*, *ἁγιωσύνη*, הוֹד, עֹז, or *exaltation*, which belongs to the Saviour, in the heavenly world. So 1 Pet. 3: 18, *θανατωθεὶς* [*Χριστὸς*] *μὲν σαρκὶ, ζωοποιηθεὶς δὲ πνεύματι*, i. e. *in his incarnate nature, subjected to sufferings and death; in his spiritual* [heavenly] *nature* or *condition, enjoying happiness and glory*. So in 1 Cor. 15: 45, *the last Adam*, i. e. Christ, is called *πνεῦμα ζωοποιοῦν*, in distinction from the *ψυχὴ ζῶσα* attributed to the first Adam. This could not be because Christ had an *immortal soul*, and Adam had only a living *animal* soul; for Adam too was immortal. It would seem, here, that *πνεῦμα* and *ψυχὴ* both designate a *spiritual* or *immortal* nature; but *πνεῦμα* here designates such a nature of a *higher* order; and the antithesis is more fully made by *ζωοποιοῦν* and *ζῶσαν, lifegiving* and *living*.

With these texts, I am now inclined to believe the one in our verse is to be classed; and that the sense is to be given to it, which I have just expressed, viz. in his *eternal* state or condition, i. e. his heavenly one, Christ presented his offering, etc. As to *διά*, there is no difficulty in making such a translation of it. It is frequently used with the genitive in order to denote the *quality, condition, cir-*

cumstances, or *means*, that have relation to any thing or person; e. g. 2 Cor. 3: 11, *διὰ δόξης*, i. q. *ἐν δόξῃ* in the other clause of the verse and in vs. 8, 9, and equivalent plainly to *ἔνδοξος*. So Rom. 2: 27, *διὰ γράμματος, with the Scripture*, i. e. *having the Scripture*, *διὰ περιτομῆς, with circumcision*, i. e. *circumcised*; Rom. 4: 11, *δι' ἀκροβυστίας, uncircumcised*; Phil. 1: 20, *εἴτε διὰ ζωῆς εἴτε διὰ θανάτου, whether living or dying*. Comp. also *διά* in Rom. 14: 20. 8: 25. Heb. 12: 1. See Wahl on *διά* no. 3. a. b. Matthiae, § 580. e.

In confirmation of this exegesis, it may be added, that in vs. 11, 12, the blood of Christ is expressly affirmed to be offered by him in the heavenly sanctuary. If v. 14 contains substantially a recognition of the same or the like sentiment, (which it seems to do), then *διὰ πνεύματος αἰωνίου* may well refer to the *eternal spiritual nature* or *condition of the Saviour in glory*, who presented himself, in the heavenly temple, with such a nature, as a spotless offering to God, and procured that pardon and purification which the sinner needs. With this interpretation Storr substantially accords, who renders *διὰ πνεύματος αἰωνίου* by "*in dem Zustande der ewigen Herrlichkeit*," or "kraft seines herrlichen Zustandes," *in the state of eternal glory*, or *by virtue of his glorious state*. That Christ was himself both the offering and the priest who presented it, is plain from Heb. 9: 11—14, and Eph. 5: 2. Heb. 10: 10.

Respecting a phrase so difficult as the above, much confidence would not be becoming. I have laid before the reader different interpretations; and if he is dissatisfied with that which I have preferred, he can choose another that will give him more satisfaction.

EXCURSUS XIX.

Heb. 9: 28. *Οὕτω καὶ ὁ Χριστὸς ἅπαξ προσενεχθεὶς, εἰς τὸ πολλῶν ἀνενεγκεῖν ἁμαρτίας.*

The importance of the phrase, and the many constructions put upon it that are inconsistent with the *usus loquendi* of the sacred writers, render it desirable accurately to determine its meaning. *To bear sin*, then, is to suffer the punishment due to it, i. e. to take

upon one's self the consequences of sin, or to subject one's self to its consequences. The phrase is sometimes used for exposure to the consequences of sin; e. g. Lev. 5: 17, 1, comp. vs. 3—5. 7: 18. *To bear iniquity*, (נָשָׂא עָוֹן) means also, *to be cut off from the congregation of God's people*, Lev. 20: 17. Num. 9: 13; it means, *to die* or *perish*, Num. 18: 22, 32. Ex. 28: 43. Lev. 24: 15, 16. So it is sometimes employed as a general expression, to designate any kind of sufferings borne or inflicted in consequence of sin; as in Num. 14: 33, 34, where in the 33d verse, *Ye shall bear your whoredoms* means, Ye shall bear the consequences of them; just as in v. 34, *Ye shall bear your iniquities* means, Ye shall bear or endure the consequences of them. Thus is the phrase employed, where the subject in question is one's own sins. But

2. *To bear the sins of others*, is to bear or endure the suffering or penalty due to them. So in Heb. 9: 26, ἁμαρτίας means the *consequences of sin* or penalty due to it. In Lam. 5: 7, Jeremiah represents the afflicted people of Israel as saying, "Our fathers have sinned, and are no more, and we have *borne their iniquities*, עֲוֹנֹתֵיהֶם סָבָלְנוּ. So in Ezek. 18: 19, 20, *to bear the iniquity of another* means, to die or perish on his account, v. 20, comp. v. 17. Is. 53: 4, *he bore our distresses*, חֳלָיֵנוּ נָשָׂא, *he carried* [or bore] *our sorrows*, מַכְאֹבֵינוּ סָבָל is explained in v. 5 by, *he was wounded for our transgressions*, מְחֻלָּל מִפְּשָׁעֵינוּ, *he was smitten on account of our transgressions*, מְרֻצָּא מֵעֲוֹנֹתֵינוּ. So נָשָׂא means, *to suffer*, Prov. 19: 19. Micah 7: 9; as does the corresponding Greek word βαστάζω in Gal. 5: 10, and φέρω in Heb. 13: 13. Ἀναφέρω has the same sense as φέρω and βαστάζω, when used in such a connexion, and corresponds to the Hebrew נָשָׂא and סָבַל. So Peter says of Jesus, ἀνήνεγκε—τὰς ἁμαρτίας ἡμῶν, *in his own body, on the cross*, 1 Pet. 2: 24; to explain which he adds, *by whose stripes ye are healed*; i. e. Jesus suffered the penalty due to our sins, in his own body, on the cross; and by his sufferings, our obligation to the penalty ceases. The passage is quoted from Is. 53: 4, 5, which has the same meaning as 53: 11, 12; and here we have, *He bore their sins*, עֲוֹנֹתָם יִסְבֹּל, *he bore* [or carried] *the sins of many*, חֵטְא־רַבִּים נָשָׂא. A comparison of all these instances, (more might be adduced), will serve to shew how plain and uniform the Scripture idiom is, in respect to the sense attached to the phrase *bearing the sin* either of one's self or of others. It always means, either 'actual suf-

fering of the consequences due to sin,' or, 'exposure to suffer them, obligation to suffer them.'

That ἁμαρτίας, Heb. 9: 28, may mean, and does mean, *the consequences of sin*, or *penalty of it*, is plain, (1) From the impossibility, that the passage here can have any other sense. The *moral* turpitude of our sins Jesus did not take upon himself; nor remove it, (as it is in itself considered); but the *consequences* of them he prevented, by his own sufferings. (2) The corresponding Hebrew words, חַטָּאוֹת, עָוֹן, and פֶּשַׁע, all mean, *punishment* or *penalty of sin*, as well as, *sin*, or *iniquity* itself.

The sentiment of the clause, then, clearly is, that Jesus, by his death, (which could take place but once), endured the penalty that our sins deserved, or bore the sorrows due to us. But this general expression is not to be understood, as if the writer meant to say, with philosophical precision, that the sufferings of Jesus were in *all* respects, and considered in *every* point of view, an exact and specific *quid pro quo*, as it regards the penalty threatened against sin. A *guilty conscience* the Saviour had not; *eternal punishment* he did not suffer; *despair of deliverance* he did not entertain. It is altogether unnecessary to suppose, that the writer meant to be understood here, with metaphysical exactness. But, that *vicarious* suffering is here designated, seems to be an unavoidable conclusion, as well from the *usus loquendi* of the Scriptures, as from the nature of the argument through the whole of chapters IX. and X.

EXCURSUS XX.

Heb. 10: 5. σῶμα δὲ κατηρτίσω μοι. Ps. 40: 7. אָזְנַיִם כָּרִיתָ לִי, i. e. mine ears hast thou opened.

But how could the Seventy render the Hebrew expression here, by σῶμα κατηρτίσω μοι? And how could the apostle follow them in this rendering; and even build an argument on such a translation, in order to establish the proposition, that the blood of goats and bullocks could not avail to take away sin? Questions which

have exceedingly perplexed commentators, and over which most of them have chosen to pass in silence. It is, indeed, much better to be silent, than to speak that which is erroneous, or will mislead the unwary. Still, the ingenuous inquirer, who wishes to see every difficulty fairly met, is offended with silence on a subject of such a nature, and cannot well resist a secret inclination to attribute it more to want of knowledge, or to want of candour, than to real prudence and discretion. At least, we ought freely to confess our ignorance, where we feel it, and not affect to be profoundly wise about things of which we may not venture to speak, or are not able to speak, either to our own satisfaction, or to that of others.

Cappell, Ernesti, and some other critics strive to maintain the probability, that the Septuagint reading in Ps. 40: 7, was formerly *ὠτίον κατηρτίσω μοι*, which by some accident has been changed, and the text of the apostle, in the New Testament, adapted to it. But of this there is no proof. Indeed, there is manifest proof that the apostle originally wrote *σῶμα* in v. 5, by a comparison with it of his expression in v. 10.

The difficulty cannot be met, then, by a change of the text; much less by such a change, when it is not authorised by any of the laws of sound criticism, and is against the context.

Were it not that the Septuagint contains the expression *σῶμα κατηρτίσω μοι*, I should be inclined to believe, that it was merely a parenthetic circumstance, thrown in by our author, in order to explain the object of his quotation. *In sacrifice and offering thou hast no delight*, says the personage who is speaking. But what is to take their place? is the natural inquiry. What shall be substituted for them? *Σῶμα κατηρτίσω μοι*, is the answer, i. e. my body, which I am to offer as a sacrifice, is to come in their place; this will be a sacrifice acceptable, efficacious. In short, if the Septuagint did not contain the expression, we might conclude that the writer of the epistle added it, in order to convey the sentiment of the whole passage in some such manner as the following: "In sacrifice and oblation I have no pleasure;" *my body hast thou adapted*, viz. for oblation, i. e. as if the writer had said, "The speaker means, *that his own body was to take the place of* sacrifice and oblation."

But as the Septuagint text now is, we are compelled to believe, that the apostle has *quoted* it, and applied it to his purpose. Has

he then made any *substantial* part of his argument to depend on the clause in question? An important inquiry, which may go some way towards removing the difficulties that the clause presents.

In vs. 8, 9, the writer presents the argument deduced from his quotation, in the following manner. "First, he says, sacrifice, and offering, and holocausts, and sin offerings, thou has no delight in, neither dost thou desire; (which are offered agreeably to the requirements of the law); next, he says, Lo I come to do thy will! He abolishes the first, then, in order to establish the second." That is, he sets aside the efficacy of ritual sacrifices and offerings, and establishes the efficacy of a Saviour's *obedience* unto death; comp. Phil. 2: 8.

Now in this conclusion, there is nothing dependent on the clause σῶμα κατηρτίσω μοι. The antithesis of *legal offerings*, is, *doing the will of God*, v. 9, viz. the obedience of the Saviour in offering up his body, v. 20. This last verse describes, indeed, the *manner* in which the obedience in question was rendered. But the argument, as expressed in the 8th and 9th verses, *is not made to depend* on the *manner* of the obedience; for the object of the writer here, is to shew the nullity of the Levitical sacrifices for spiritual purposes, and the fact that the Old Testament discloses this, and intimates their abolition.

I must regard, then, the use of σῶμα κατηρτίσω μοι by the apostle, as rather an *incidental* circumstance, than as an essential one. He found it, in the text of the Septuagint which he used. It was well adapted for the particular purpose he had in view; as it turned the mind of the reader to Christ, as the true expiatory victim, rather than to the sacrifices prescribed by the law. It was altogether accordant with the general tenor of the passage which he was citing, and the conclusion which he was to adduce from it. But he does not make, (as we have seen), the force of his argument to depend upon it. Were this the fact, and were we to suppose, (and we have no *critical* evidence for believing the contrary,) that the Hebrew text stood, in his day, as it now stands; it would be a case in point, to prove the extent to which the sacred writers have deemed it proper to employ the *argumentum ad hominem*, and adapt their reasonings to the modes of explaining the Scriptures practised by their readers. As it now is, I do not feel that much dependance can be placed on it, to establish a proposition of this nature; for on

the whole, I must view the employment of the phrase, as found in the Septuagint, rather *incidental*, than *essential* to the writer's purpose. Still, thus much is clearly decided by the case before us, viz. that the apostles did not feel under obligation in all respects to adhere to a *literal* use of the sacred text, but quoted *ad sensum* rather than *ad literam*. Even σῶμα κατηρτίσω μοι may be brought within the general limits of an *ad sensum* quotation, as Storr has remarked; *for preparing a body*, in this case, is preparing it for an offering,—to be devoted to the service of God. Now this is a species of obedience of the highest nature. If a body were given to the Saviour, which he voluntarily devoted to death, Phil. 2: 8, then *were his ears indeed opened*, or, *he was truly obedient*. The implication of the phrase σῶμα κατηρτίσω μοι, in the connexion where it stands, is, that this body was to be a victim, instead of the legal sacrifices; of course, *a devotedness of the highest nature* is implied. *Ad sensum*, then, in a general point of view, the text may be regarded as cited; and this, oftentimes, is all at which the New Testament writers aim.

One more difficulty, however, remains. It is alleged, that Ps. xl. cannot well be applied to the Messiah. It rather belongs to *David* himself. How then could the writer of our epistle appeal to it, for a proof that the obedience unto death, of the *Messiah*, was to accomplish what the Jewish sacrifices could not, viz. a removal of the penalty due to sin?

That there are difficulties, in the way of interpreting this Psalm as *originally* having had direct respect to the Messiah, every intelligent and candid reader must allow. For it may be asked, (1) What was the deliverance from impending destruction, which Ps. 40: 2—3 [1, 2] describes? On what occasion was the song of gratitude for deliverance uttered? vs. 4—6 [3—5]. (2) How could the *iniquities* of him, "who knew no sin," take hold of him? v. 13 [12]. (3) How could the Messiah anticipate such troubles, as are alluded to in vs. 12—14 [11—13]; and particularly, how can he, who when suspended on the cross prayed that his enemies might be forgiven, be supposed to have uttered such imprecations as are contained in vs. 15, 16 [14, 15]?

To avoid the difficulties to which these questions advert, some have supposed, that the first and last parts of the Psalm in question relate to David, while vs. 7—9 [6—8] contain a prediction respect-

ing the Messiah; at least, that they are spoken concerning him. But it is not easy to conceive, how more than one person can be spoken of throughout the Psalm, it being all of the same tenor, and throughout appearing to be made up of words spoken by a suffering person, who had indeed been delivered from some evils, but was still exposed to many more.

Others have maintained, that the whole Psalm relates only to David; and that, consequently, the writer of our epistle *accommodates* his argument to the Jewish allegorical explanation of it, probably current at the time when he wrote. Among these are some, whose general views of theology are far from coinciding with those of the neological class of critics. But there is a difficulty in regard to this, which must be felt by every reflecting and sober minded man. How could the apostle employ as sound and Scriptural argument, adapted to prove the insufficiency of the Jewish sacrifices, an interpretation of Scripture not only allegorical, but without any solid foundation? And how could he appeal to it, as exhibiting the words of the Saviour himself, when *David was the only person* whom it concerned? If the Old Testament has no other relation to the Messiah, than what is built upon interpretations that are the offspring of fancy and ingenious allegory; then how can we shew, that the proof of a Messiah deduced from it is any thing more than fanciful or allegorical? And was it consistent with sound integrity, with sincere and upright regard to truth, to press the Hebrews with an argument, which the writer himself knew to have no solid basis? Or if he did not know this, then in what light are we to regard him, as an interpreter of Scripture, and a teacher of Christian principles?

Considerations such as these questions suggest, render it difficult to admit the opinion under examination, without abandoning some of the fundamental principles, on which our confidence in the real verity of the word of God rests.

Nor does that scheme of interpretation, which admits a *double sense* of Scripture, relieve our difficulties. This scheme explains so much of the Psalm, as will most conveniently apply to David, as having a *literal* application to him; and so much of it as will conveniently apply to the Messiah, it refers to him. Truly a great saving of labour in investigation, and of perplexity and difficulty, might apparently be made, if we could adopt such an expedient!

But the consequences of admitting such a principle should be well weighed. What book on earth has a *double* sense, unless it is a book of designed *enigmas!* And even this has but *one real* meaning. The heathen oracles indeed could say, *Aio te, Pyrrhe, Romanos posse vincere;* but can such an *equivoque* be admissible into the oracles of the living God? And if a *literal* sense, and an *occult* sense can, at one and the same time, and by the same words, be conveyed; who that is uninspired shall tell us what the *occult* sense is? By what laws of interpretation is it to be judged? By none that belong to human language; for other books than the Bible, have not a double sense attached to them.

For these and such like reasons, the scheme of attaching a double sense to the Scriptures is inadmissible. It sets afloat all the fundamental principles of interpretation, by which we arrive at established conviction and certainty, and casts us upon the boundless ocean of imagination and conjecture, without rudder or compass.

If it be said, that the author of our epistle was inspired, and therefore he was able correctly to give the *occult* sense of Ps. 40: 7—9 [6—8]; the answer is obvious. The writer in deducing his argument from these verses, plainly appeals to an interpretation of them which his readers would recognize, and to which, he took it for granted, they would probably consent. Otherwise the argument could have contained nothing in it of a convincing nature to them; as the whole of it must have rested, in their minds, upon the bare assertion and imagination of the writer.

May not the whole quotation, then, be merely in the way of *accommodating* the language of the Old Testament, in order to express the writer's own views? Such cases are indeed frequent in the New Testament. God says, by the prophet Hosea, "When Israel was a child, then I loved him, and called my Son out of Egypt, 11: 1." Now this is not *prediction*, but *narration*. But when Matthew describes the flight of Joseph and Mary, with the infant Jesus, to Egypt, he says, 'This took place, so that this passage of Scripture [in Hosea] had an accomplishment, *ἵνα πληρωθῇ* κ. τ. λ.' Now here is, evidently, nothing more than a *similarity* of events; so that what is said of Israel, God's son in ancient times, might be affirmed of his Son Jesus, in later times, in a still higher sense, and in a similar manner. May not the writer of our epistle have accommodated the language of Ps. xl., in a similar way?

May he not have merely expressed his own views in language borrowed from the Old Testament, without intending to aver, that (as it stands in the original Scriptures) it has the same meaning which he now gives to it?

This would indeed relieve, in a great measure, the difficulties under which the passage labours, if it could be admitted. But the nature of the writer's argument seems to forbid the admission of it. He had asserted, (which was entirely opposed to the feelings and belief of most Jewish readers), that "the blood of bulls and goats could not take away sin." What was the proof of this? His own authority; or that of the Jewish Scriptures? Clearly he makes an appeal to the latter; and argues, that, by plain implication, they teach the inefficacy of Jewish sacrifices, and the future rejection of them. Consequently, we cannot admit here a mere expression of the writer's own sentiments, in language borrowed from the Old Testament.

Another supposition, however, remains to be examined, in regard to the subject under consideration; *which is*, that Ps. XL. relates *throughout* to the Messiah. This is certainly a *possible* case. I mean that there is no part of this Psalm, which may not be interpreted so as to render its relation to the Messiah possible, without doing violence to the laws of language and interpretation. To advert to the objections suggested on page 381; it may be replied to the first, that the enemies of the Saviour very often plotted against his life and endeavoured to destroy it, and that he, as often, escaped out of their hands, until he voluntarily gave up himself to death. The thanksgivings, in the first part of Ps. XL., may relate to some or all of these escapes. If it be replied, that the writer of our epistle represents the Psalm as spoken, when the Messiah was *εἰσερχόμενος εἰς τὸν κόσμον, coming* [i. e. about to come] *into the world*, and therefore before his birth; the answer is, that the phrase by no means implies, of necessity, that the Messiah uttered the sentiments here ascribed to him, before his incarnation, but during it. *Εἰσερχόμενος, entering, being entered*, or, *when he had entered* into the world, he said, *Θυσίαν κ. τ. λ.* That the Saviour prayed to God, gave thanks, made supplications and deprecations, as men do, need not be proved to any reader of the Evangelists. On what particular occasion in the Messiah's life, the words in Ps. 40: 7—9 were uttered, it is needless to inquire. Indeed, that they were ever *for-*

mally and *ad literam* uttered, it is quite needless to shew; inasmuch as all which the Psalmist intends by the expression of them, is, that they should be descriptive of his true character; which would be such, that we might well suppose him to utter them, or, that they would be appropriate to him. In a word, the Psalmist represents the Messiah as uttering them, merely in order to exhibit the true nature of the Messiah's character.

The second objection appears, at first view, more formidable. How could the *sinless* Messiah be represented as suffering for his *own iniquities?* Plainly, I answer, he could not be. The iniquities of others might be laid upon him; as the Scriptures plainly testify that they were, 1 Pet. 2: 24. Heb. 9: 28. Is. 53: 4, 5, 12; i. e. he might suffer on account of the sins of *others*, or in their stead; but as to sins of his *own*, he had none to answer for. The whole strength of the objection, however, lies in the version of the word עֲוֹנֹתַי (Ps. 40: 13), which the objector translates *my iniquities, sins, transgressions.* But who, that is well acquainted with the Hebrew idiom, does not know, that עָוֹן means, *punishment, calamity, misfortune*, as well as *iniquity*, etc.? David, when he was chased away from Jerusalem by his rebel son, calls his calamity his עָוֹן. *Perhaps the Lord*, says he, *will look favourably* בַּעֲוֹנִי, *on my calamity*, 2 Sam. 16: 12; for his sin it was not, in this case. Comp. Ps. 31: 11. Is. 5: 18. A concordance will supply other cases, particularly cases where the meaning is *penalty, punishment.* Analogous to the case of עָוֹן, we have seen to be that of חַטָּאת and אָשָׁם; see on chap. 9: 28. Excurs. XIX. In Ps. 40: 13, then, עֲוֹנֹתַי may, agreeably to the *usus loquendi*, be translated, *calamities, distresses;* and that these came upon the Messiah (וַתַּשִּׂיגֻנִי), will not be doubted.

So, in 2 Cor. 5: 21, *ἁμαρτίαν ἐποίησε*, i. e. God *made* Christ *a sin offering*, or, subjected him to calamity; and in Heb. 9: 26, *ἀθέτησιν ἁμαρτίας* means, *a removing of the calamitous consequences of sin.*

The third objection may be very briefly answered. Nothing can be easier than to suppose the Messiah might, at any period of his public life, have anticipated severe trials, and have deprecated them; as we know full well, how strongly he deprecated his final sufferings when he was in the garden of Gethsemane. That he should *formally* and *literally* use the identical words of the 40th Psalm, was not necessary; but that he should have been in a condition,

such as the language there describes, is all that is necessary to justify the application of the Psalm to him.

In regard to the last objection, which has respect to the *imprecations* contained in the latter part of Ps. XL.; they may be, and probably are, viewed in a different light by different persons. Considered as simple *maledictions*, they would be unworthy of the Psalmist, or of the Messiah. But as *denunciations* against the impenitent and persevering enemies of God and of David, or of Christ, they present themselves to the mind in a very different light. David did frequently utter denunciations against his enemies. So did Christ against his; e. g. against the Scribes and Pharisees, against Jerusalem, and against the Jewish nation. Yet who will say, that this was for want of tenderness in him, or of benevolent feelings towards those who were his enemies? No one can say this, who considers the whole of his character as represented by the Evangelists. If then he might, and did in fact, utter denunciations against his enemies and persecutors, he might be represented as doing this by the Psalmist, without any error committed *in so doing*.

The objections, then, do not appear to be of a conclusive nature, which are made to the application of the 40th Psalm to the Messiah. Still, I freely acknowledge, that had not the New Testament referred to this Psalm, as descriptive of the work of the Messiah, I should have been satisfied, in general, with the application of it to David himself, or even to the people of Israel collectively considered. Yet a minute consideration of vs. 7, 8 [6, 7] certainly might serve to suggest some difficulty, in respect to such an application. *Obedience* is there represented as the *substitute* for sacrifices. So the writer of our epistle understood it. And it is said to be written in the sacred volume, that this would be the case, respecting the individual whose obedience is there described. Is this any where written respecting the obedience of David? Is the obedience of the Jewish nation any where represented as a *substitute* for sacrifices? Rather, did not a part of their obedience consist in offering them?

After all, however, the whole passage might, perhaps, be construed as merely affirming, that obedience is more acceptable to God than sacrifice, and that this is so declared in other Scriptures. Comp. 1 Sam. 15: 22. Ps. 50: 9 seq. Is. 1: 11 seq. At least, this mode of interpretation must be admitted to be a *possible* one.

Let us grant, then, what cannot fairly be denied, that the 40th

Psalm, according to general laws of interpretation, *might* be applied to David. Is it not equally plain, that there is nothing in it which may not, without doing any violence to the laws of language, be applied to David's *Son*, in a still higher and nobler sense? After what has been suggested, in respect to this application, I shall venture to consider the application itself as possible.

Here then is presented a case of the following kind. A Psalm composed by an inspired writer, is, (in itself considered, i. e. the words or diction being simply regarded), capable of an application to David, or to the Son of David, the Messiah. To whom shall it be applied by us? If there be nothing but simply the Psalm itself to direct our interpretation, the answer must be, 'To David;' for the natural application of the words of Scripture, (which in themselves are not necessarily predictions), is to the persons in being when they were written. But, if we have a good reason for making the application of them in a *prophetic* sense, to some future personage, then ought we to make such an application. Consequently, the question in respect to the application of the 40th Psalm depends on the fact, whether we have sufficient reason to construe it as *prediction*, i. e. as descriptive of a personage who was to appear at a future period, viz. of David's Son. In itself it is capable of such an explanation. Paul has actually made such an application of it. The nature of the case shews, too, that the Hebrews of that time were accustomed so to explain it; for otherwise, the argument of the apostle would not have been admitted as of any force, by his readers. Whence did the Hebrews derive such an interpretation? Or, (which is of higher moment), how could the apostle appeal to Ps. 40: 7, 8, for proof of the efficacy of Christ's obedience unto death, as well as of the inefficacy of ritual sacrifices? This appeal, then, under such circumstances as shew, that the stress of his argument lies upon the meaning he gives to the passage of Scripture which he quotes, settles the question how the 40th Psalm is to be interpreted, with all those who admit the authority of the writer of our epistle, either as a teacher of Christian doctrine, or an expositor of the word of God. At all events, it cannot be shewn, that the 40th Psalm has no original relation to the Messiah. To shew that it is *capable* of another interpretation, is effecting nothing. The second Psalm, and all other Psalms relating to Christ, borrow their imagery—their costume, from the times when they were written,

and the persons, manners, and customs then existing; and of course, in a greater or less degree, appear, at first view, to relate only to them. In describing the future King of the Jews, the writers of ancient times would naturally borrow their imagery from the kings of that day. But to affirm, that because they did this, they had reference, and could have reference, only to the kings of their times, would be a position as little consistent with the principles of language and interpretation, as it is with the numerous declarations of the writers of the New Testament.

It will be easily perceived, that in admitting the possibility of applying the 40th Psalm to David, I have admitted that vs. 7 and 8 may be interpreted, as expressing merely the general principle, that *obedience is better than sacrifices*. But if we suppose, with the writer of our epistle, that David, when he composed this Psalm, meant to intimate, that this obedience was to be "obedience unto death, even the death of the cross," then must it follow, of course, that the Psalm is altogether inapplicable to David; for neither his obedience, nor death, nor that of any other person, (the Messiah excepted), could supersede the ritual of the Mosaic law, and prepare the way for its abolition. Supposing then the apostle to have rightly interpreted the words of Ps. XL., (and who shall correct his exegesis?) the impropriety of applying the Psalm to David is plain; and the propriety of referring it to the Messiah needs no farther vindication.

FINIS.



CPSIA information can be obtained
at www.ICGtesting.com
Printed in the USA
LVHW010041160523
747098LV00003B/58



This work has been selected by scholars as being culturally important, and is part of the knowledge base of civilization as we know it. This work was reproduced from the original artifact, and remains as true to the original work as possible. Therefore, you will see the original copyright references, library stamps (as most of these works have been housed in our most important libraries around the world), and other notations in the work.

This work is in the public domain in the United States of America, and possibly other nations. Within the United States, you may freely copy and distribute this work, as no entity (individual or corporate) has a copyright on the body of the work.

As a reproduction of a historical artifact, this work may contain missing or blurred pages, poor pictures, errant marks, etc. Scholars believe, and we concur, that this work is important enough to be preserved, reproduced, and made generally available to the public. We appreciate your support of the preservation process, and thank you for being an important part of keeping this knowledge alive and relevant.

